This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

**Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

**About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD

ÆTATIS 30

*Engraved by C.J. Stodart, from a miniature by Miss Emily Combe.*

*London Macmillan & Cº 1880*

# WILLIAM GEORGE WARD

AND

# THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

BY

WILFRID WARD

STANFORD LIBR.

London
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK
1889
HO

166230

STANFORD LIBR.

## MEMORIAL LINES TO WILLIAM GEORGE WARD

BY

THE POET LAUREATE

FAREWELL, whose living like I shall not find
—Whose faith and work were bells of full accord,—
My friend, thou most unworldly of mankind,
Most generous of all Ultramontanes, Ward!
How subtle at tierce and quart of mind with mind!
How loyal in the following of thy Lord!

# PREFACE

THE writer in the *Times*[1] of the Jubilee Retrospect of the events of the present reign, in touching on the Ecclesiastical aspect of the Victorian era, says: "The Catholic—or as it is named from the accident of its method the Tractarian—Movement in the Church of England is the first to arrest the attention of the observer;" and after referring to the nature of its influence on the religion of England, he speaks as follows of the climax of the original Oxford Movement: Its originators "found themselves stranded in an eddy of the stream they had set in motion, and while the Catholic revival vivified and transformed the English Church, itself being modified and transformed in the process, its distinguished pioneers, with Newman and Ward at their head, joined the Church of Rome."

The mention of these two names reminds us of a fact, not without importance in its bearing on the significance of the Movement, that the Oxford party, at the time of its greatest prominence, consisted in reality of two schools, whose views and starting point were by no means identical; and that representative members of each eventually found the outcome of their principles in the Church of Rome.

The old Tractarian party, which carried on its work in comparative peace up to 1839, may be said to have represented the common measure of the views of its three leaders Newman, Pusey, and Keble. It was a vigorous effort at the restoration of the Catholic elements in Anglicanism as they had

[1] See *Times*, 21st June 1887.

existed in the seventeenth century. Various causes about this time—among them the publication of the *Remains* of Hurrell Froude—gave a new colour to the Movement. Froude's vivid picture of Church Authority and Catholic Sanctity took possession of many earnest and thoughtful minds, which had been quite insensible to the attractions of Anglican tradition. A new school was formed, which from 1839 to 1845 had a large—perhaps ultimately the chief—share in guiding the fortunes of the Movement. Its motive power was primarily ethical, and in some sense philosophical, as the motive power of the older school had been primarily historical.

Of the early Tractarians Cardinal Newman has given a full account in the *Apologia*. His own starting point was identical with theirs, and he traces the development of their views, in his own case, to genuinely Catholic conclusions. To the later school he refers comparatively briefly, and speaks of its members as being "of a cast of mind in no small degree uncongenial to his own." "A new school of thought was rising," he writes, "as is usual in doctrinal inquiries, and was sweeping the original party of the Movement aside and was taking its place."

Of the manner and degree in which "he surrendered himself to the influence" of this younger party, the Cardinal gives indeed a full account; but neither in the *Apologia* nor elsewhere, so far as I know, does there exist any express description of the origin and aims of a school of thought which had a marked effect on the progress of the Movement, and on its relations with more recent religious controversy. The supplying of this want is one of the objects with which the present volume has been written. Of my father's relations with the party of the Movement various estimates are given in the following pages by contemporaries well qualified to speak. But whether we accept the Dean of Westminster's view that "he succeeded Dr. Newman as their acknowledged leader,"[1] or qualify this state-

[1] See *Recollections of A. P. Stanley*, by G. Granville Bradley, Dean of Westminster, p. 65.

ment as some others have done, by general consent he seems to have been the typical representative of the phase to which I have referred.

There has been, however, an additional reason for the following pages besides the one I have mentioned. Independently of his position with respect to the Movement, there is a very general testimony on the part of his contemporaries as to the influence of Mr. Ward's personality in the Oxford of half a century ago. This influence extended to theological opponents as well as to friends. The chief representative of those opinions which afterwards nearly succeeded in expelling all remnants of Tractarianism from the University,—Professor Jowett,—in the "Reminiscences" which are published in this volume, bears cordial witness to his "intellectual obligations" to Mr. Ward, and to an influence on his contemporaries which few have surpassed.[1]

It has been urged on me by many of my father's friends that some attempt should be made to record for another generation the personal qualities to which this influence was due. The delineation, then, of a personality which was sympathetic to men of such opposite schools as the Dean of St. Paul's and Professor Jowett, to men differing as widely in their position and surroundings as Lord Tennyson and the Dean of Norwich, or as Professor Bonamy Price and Lord Coleridge, is the second object of my book. In the case of my father, as in that of Dr. Johnson, his conversation had in it much of which there is no trace in his writing,—which was, indeed, the antithesis to his writing. His style was in early days extremely dull and shapeless—as he frequently remarked himself. It had in it none of that pointed character, or of the amusing and dramatic elements, which his contemporaries note in him as a talker. The biographical portion of my work, consequently, to be quite satisfactory, needed the contemporary notes of a Boswell; and the absence of any such record of his conversa-

[1] See Appendix D.

tion has been a drawback. Of few persons was the saying less true, "Le style c'est l'homme." The deficiency, however, has been in some measure atoned for by the great kindness of his friends and contemporaries in placing at my disposal their recollections of his sayings and ways at Oxford, and of his influence there. My special thanks are due in this respect to Professor Jowett, the Deans of Durham and St. Paul's, Lord Selborne, the Dean of Norwich, the late Dean of Rochester, Lord Blachford, Father Whitty, Archdeacon Browne, the late Mr. Bonamy Price, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Wegg-Prosser, Mr. G. R. Moncrieff, and the Bishop of London. But above all I owe grateful acknowledgments to the Poet-Laureate for placing on record a memorial of his friendship for my father in the beautiful verses which are prefixed to this volume, every line of which suggests some feature which appeals to those who knew him and understood him, as at once characteristic and distinctive.

My work has been unfortunately deprived of the advantage of the most valuable series of my father's letters which it was to have embodied—those preserved by the late Mr. A. L. Phillipps (afterwards Mr. de Lisle) of Garendon, written from Oxford between the years 1841 and 1845. These letters have been within the last few years accidentally mislaid. My best thanks are due, however, to Mrs. de Lisle for those which she has sent to me, and to Mrs. A. H. Clough, Canon Liddon (Dr. Pusey's biographer), the Dean of St. Paul's, the late Dean of Rochester, Dr. Bloxam, Mr. Benham (the biographer of Archbishop Tait), for portions of his writing which they have preserved, and which are to be found in their place in the following pages. Cardinal Newman has likewise allowed me to print one of his letters to my father, and I owe him gratitude for the patience and kindness with which on more than one occasion he allowed me to question him with respect to his own recollections of the Oxford Movement. I must take this opportunity of thanking him for his great kindness in searching among his papers for my father's old letters. When I come

to deal with his Catholic life the collection which the Cardinal has placed at my disposal will be very valuable to me.

To the Dean of St. Paul's and to the late Lord Iddesleigh I am under obligations for the numerous pamphlets in connection with my father's Oxford controversies which they have lent me. To the former, indeed, the Dean of St. Paul's, the following work owes a great deal. Much of my information as to the events and spirit of that phase of the Movement with which I am chiefly concerned is derived from private notes of his to which he has given me access; several alterations have been made in my text at his suggestion, with a view to giving an account which should appeal as substantially true to all those who took part in the Movement, whether in the event they joined the Catholic Church with Cardinal Newman and my father, or remained with Dr. Pusey. At the same time it is of course impossible but that the significance and colour of facts should be somewhat different to those who were led by them in such different directions.

I must add to my list of obligations a valuable letter in MS. written by the late Mr. J. S. Mill to Auguste Comte on the subject of my father's book, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, which I owe to the kindness of Miss Helen Taylor. Though Mr. Ward's relations with Mill belong chiefly to a later period, the letter has great value as showing how early Mill's interest in him began; and from the fact that the book which called it forth contained the germs of those arguments on the intuitional philosophy to which Mill in later years attached so much importance. "In answering them," he wrote, "I believe that I am answering the best that is likely to be said by any future champion."

I will only add that although I very frequently conversed with my father on the subject of his Oxford days, and those conversations have been of great use in making me understand his spirit and aims in the Movement, I have not trusted to my memory without corroboration in his writing for anything save

characteristic anecdotes; and many of these were taken down by me in his lifetime. All that portion of the work which contains the history either of his own mind or of the Movement is taken from his copious writings of that time,—sermons, essays, and letters,—or from the recollections of contemporaries. I have cited his own words as far as possible, though minor details and connecting links have been summarised by myself. This has been necessary alike for the sake of brevity, and from the fact that such matters are often stated by himself incidentally, and in a context which is not to the purpose of my book.

The Reminiscences so liberally supplied by my father's contemporaries, both orally and by letter, have occasionally involved the repetition by different persons of the same details. In such cases it has been impossible to print all that has been written in the text; but I have instead quoted so much in the text as was suited to the course of my narrative; and where the omissions have been considerable I have inserted the documents without abridgment in the Appendix.

Since the body of this book was in type I have received from the Dean of Westminster some interesting selections from the correspondence of the late Dean Stanley, which have reference to my father's early relations with Newman and with Stanley himself. These, by the kind permission of the present Master of the Temple and Sir George Grove, I have placed in an Appendix (see Appendix I).

FRESHWATER, ISLE OF WIGHT,
*April* 1889.

# ANALYTICAL CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I

### BOYHOOD OF WILLIAM GEORGE WARD


PAGE

Parentage . . . . . 1

Early love of the theatre—Great mathematical talent . . 3

Dislike of general society . . . . . 4

Goes to school at Winchester . . . . . 5

Lord Selborne's Recollections . . . . . 5

Confidence in his own memory—in his mathematical powers—unfailing accuracy in both departments . . . 7

Professions of incompetence in verse-making . . . 8

Specimens of his Latin and English verses—Makes them purposely grotesque—*versus scribere cogor* . . . . 9

Early religious earnestness, and horror at the immorality of Winchester School . . . . . 10

Love of abstract thought—Lack of observation of natural objects . 11

Extract from schoolboy Essay . . . . . 11

Lord Selborne on the system of "Prefects" at Winchester . 15

Ward's conscientiousness and unpopularity as Senior Prefect . 16

Rebellion of Juniors . . . . . 17

Early melancholy and sensitiveness . . . . 18


## CHAPTER II

### LIFE AT OXFORD


Ward at Christ Church—Undergraduate friends . . 19

The Oxford Union—"Ward Tory-chief"—Record of his part in the debates . . . . . 20

PAGE

The Dean of St. Paul's on the speeches of Ward, Lowe, and Cardwell . . . . . 22

Archdeacon Browne's Recollections of Ward and of the "Uniomachia" . . . . . 23

His father's loss of fortune—Scholarship at Lincoln . . 25

Examination for his degree—Frank confessions of ignorance—Dr. Jenkyns on Ward's "candid ingenuity" . . . . 26

Elected Fellow of Balliol . . . . . 28

Recollections of personal characteristics by contemporaries—Joyousness—Abruptness—First meeting with A. P. Stanley in Faber's rooms—Love of exaggeration—Of making the "Moderates" stare—The Late Dean of Rochester's Recollections—Ward's Johnsonian Rejoinders—Love of Paradox in Expression—Reality of Feeling and Thought—Manliness and Kindliness—Zeal for Truth—Brilliancy—Lord Coleridge's Impressions . . . . . 29

Recollections of Mr. J. Lonsdale . . . . . 32

Impressions of Mr. G. R. Moncreiff—Ward's Socratic Dialogues—Characteristic humour in teaching mathematics . . 33

Mr. Thomas Mozley's Recollections . . . . . 34

Ward's candid comments on himself—"My intellect almost infinite"—"Deplorable moral deficiencies"—Dislike of sermons—Enjoyment of stories against himself . . 35

Intensity of enjoyment and *ennui*—"Out of my line"—Clumsiness and incapacity for "dealing with matter" . 36

Melancholy—Escape from himself in music and the drama—Constant ill-health referred to in a Letter—Dramatic Sketches to his Friends—Coffin and Oakeley—"Thomas Aquinas dancing a ballet"—Lenten performances next door to Dr. Pusey—Present Bishop of London's first interview with Ward—Olympic Revels and Olympic Devils . . 37

Dean of St. Paul's Recollections of Ward—Quixotic conscientiousness—Dignity from "deep seriousness"—The other aspect of his character—"Unembarrassed as a schoolboy let loose"—Observer Johnson's dinners . . . . 42

Bishop of London's Recollections of a party at Balliol—Ward's scruples about going—His enjoyment of the party—"Could have proposed to any one of them on the spot" . . 44

## CHAPTER III

### THREE MOVEMENTS OF ENGLISH THOUGHT

Dean Stanley on the intellectual activity and moral earnestness of the first half of the century . . . . . 45

PAGE

Ward affected by three schools of thought in turn . . 46

Radical school of the two Mills and Bentham—Its origin, aims, and history—Grote and the two Austins—*London* and *Westminster* Reviews . . . . . 47

Opposition of the school to the Established Church—Reform Bill of '32—General fear of Disestablishment . . . 48

Two Movements to save the Establishment—Schools of Arnold and of Newman . . . . . 49

Arnold's characteristics—Points in common between him and early Oriel school of Milman—His scheme for Church reform—Resemblance between his proposal and Dr. Martineau's . . . . . 50

Arnold's intellectual system a compromise—Its want of consistency—Its logical results exhibited by his intellectual descendants, Stanley, Jowett, and Matthew Arnold . 51

Tractarian Movement—Contrast between Tractarian and Arnoldian view of the English Church . . . . . 52

Original Movement at first mainly practical—Opposition to scheme for suppression of Irish Sees—Keble on the "National Apostasy"—Palmer, Hook, and Perceval share in this Movement . . . . . 53

Intellectual element developed by Hurrell Froude and Newman—Tracts for the Times—Palmer's opposition to the Tracts—Contrast between methods of Newman and Palmer—Newman's uncertainty as to the final outcome of his own principles . . . . . 55

Contrast between intellectual principles of Liberals and Tractarians—Tractarianism designed to check Popery—Arnold's desire to check irreligious Radicalism—Devotion of both parties to Anglicanism—Arnold prophesies that Newmanism will end in Popery—Newman that Liberalism will wreck Christian Faith—Fulfilment of both prophecies . . . 56

Declaration of war between the parties—The Hampden Case in 1836 . . . . . 58

## CHAPTER IV

### EARLY INTELLECTUAL AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY

Influence of Mill and Bentham—Ward's admiration of their system, completeness, sincerity, clearness, love of reform . 60

Early sense of inconsistency of Anglicanism—The moderate Churchman steers between "the Scylla and Charybdis of Aye and No" . . . . . 64

PAGE

Whately's comparative consistency—Finding Anglican theology inconsistent he gets rid of it—*Solitudinem facit, pacem appellat*—Ward attracted by his fairness to all parties . 65

Higher influence of Arnold—Personal and spiritual rather than intellectual—His Christian enthusiasm and destruction of all unreality in religion—The Rugby boys, Lake, Clough, Stanley . . . . . 67

Arnold's system a protest against unreality of Protestantism and against antiquarianism of Newmanites—Fictitious sacredness (in his view) of sacerdotal and sacramental system—Ward's concurrence in this view—Ward's influence as representing the Rugby school in Oxford—Mozley's testimony. 68

Ward's references to Arnold a few years later in the *British Critic*—Admires his opposition to wordliness, the reality of his treatment of Scripture, his opposition to the passivity of Lutheranism . . . . . 69

Ward finds the intellectual principles of Arnold and Whately sceptical—His trust in Arnold's ethical teaching remains—He recognises it to be based on the moral nature, not the intellectual—Its true basis was the truth of its ethical precepts and the superior sanctity and spiritual perceptions of Arnold himself, as detected by conscience . . 72

Newman attracts him on these principles as exhibiting a still higher ethical system and spiritual authority—"True guidance in return for loving obedience, the prime need of man" 73

Connection between dogma and morality—Theism essential to the rudiments of morality—Plenitude of doctrine to highest sanctity . . . . . 74

Extract from Ward's writings on the sceptical tendency of Arnold's principle of private judgment—Extracts on instinctive recognition of the sacredness of higher teaching—On obedience as the road to religious knowledge . . . . 75

## CHAPTER V

### CATHOLIC INFLUENCES

Early religious impressions from Catholic services—Tendency to Rome existed before he joined Newman's party—Influence of Milner—Ward's assertion that he could not have joined Newman as long as he approved the Reformation . . 78

A visit to Arnold at Rugby—Ward reads novels all day—Arnold tired with school work finds evening discussions exhausting—Goes to bed on Ward's departure—Ward's dissatisfaction with Arnold's answers to his difficulties—Ward's early

PAGE

suspicion of Newman's sermons—Refuses to hear them—A plot to bring him to St. Mary's—Hears him preach—Whole feeling towards him changed — Professor Bonamy Price's recollections . . . . . 79

Newman's lectures in Adam de Brome's chapel—Ward attends them—Appearance of Froude's *Remains*—Ward tends to Tractarianism—Lord Blachford's recollections—The Dean of Norwich's description of Ward and Stanley at Newman's lectures—The late Dean of Rochester's (Scott) impressions of the change to Newmanism—Ward "jumped for joy" at Froude's writings — Resemblance, intellectually, between Ward and Froude—"At length the Church of England fell. Will she ever rise again?" . . . . . 81

Froude's thoroughness contrasted with Arnold's incompleteness—Intellectually—Ethically—Arnold feared the full Gospel ideal of sanctity . . . . . 85

Extracts from Ward's writings criticising Arnold on the points in question—Also on interpretation of Scripture . . 86

Early form of Ward's theory of Church Authority . . 91

Love of Catholic ethics—Dislike of the Anglican Communion service—A nightmare about Thomism—"A cold, cramping, stifling uniformity" . . . . . 93

Ward pays Bonamy Price a visit at Rugby (September 1838) before joining the Newmanites—Mr. Price's recollections—"A fish and a dog" . . . . . 96

## CHAPTER VI

### EARLY FRIENDSHIPS

Ward ordained deacon as an Arnoldian, priest as a Newmanite—Signs the Articles in a different sense on each occasion . 99

Dean Lake's recollections—No tutor in Oxford had so much intellectual influence as Ward—"Last of the great conversationalists" . . . . . 100

Open discussions on religious first principles—Startles old-fashioned Churchmen—Mr. Wynell Mayow's recollections—"What is the difference between faith and prejudice?" . . 101

Moral influence over undergraduates—Friendship with theological opponents—Stanley, Jowett, Tait . . . . . 102

Tait's recollections of Stanley and Ward, published in *Good Words* . . . . . 104

PAGE

Ward's friendship for Arthur Hugh Clough—Upsets Clough by sceptical arguments—Clough's references to Ward in his correspondence . . . . . 105

Ward's recollections of Clough . . . . . 107

Clough's increasing scepticism—He and Ward drift apart—Clough's *Qua cursum ventus* . . . . . 110

Professor Jowett's recollections of Ward—Geniality—"Prodigious" knowledge of theatrical persons and performances—Things serious and profane lay near together in his mind, but never confused—Love of startling those who misunderstood this—Preaches a sermon of Arnold's at Littlemore with Newmanite alterations—His appearance—*Sermons, Operas, etc.*—"Of a most noble presence"—Like Socrates in dialectics, like Falstaff in making fun . . . . . 112

Jowett's recollections of Balliol Fellows—Carr, Oakeley, Tait, Chapman, Payne, Scott, Owen, Lonsdale—Recollections of Jenkyns, Master of Balliol . . . . . 114

Ward's friendship with Tait and Oakeley—Theological differences—Undiminished personal regard—Dean Lake's recollections of the matter—Ward's testimonial to Tait, as candidate for Rugby Head-mastership . . . . . 117

Tait, Oakeley, and Ward in the Common Room—Characteristic anecdotes—Lonsdale's recollections—Friendship lasted through life—Ward's reference to Oakeley after his death—Tait's allusion to Ward and Oakeley, "two more single-hearted and devoted men, I believe, never lived" . . 121

Friendship with Goulburn, Dean of Norwich—Goulburn's recollections—Ward's vivacity of mind and love of amusement—Early love of variety in the Breviary—His gaiety kept in check by hard work and deep religiousness—Resemblance to Gladstone—"Why should a man love his relations"—"My nature does not dictate it"—Goulburn shocked at his profanity—"David, I daresay, was a great fool"—Repentance for having used such language after he joined Newman's party—Goulburn's first meeting with Ward—Ward's humour as mathematical tutor—His reading of prayers "such as one hears only once in a lifetime" . . . . . 124

Ward's friendship for the poor—Elements in his character revealed in close friendships with relations or friends which were unknown to the world—Appreciation of a woman's tact and sympathy—Dislike of the pedantry of intellectualism—Recollections of his friend Mrs. Richard Ward and of his eldest daughter . . . . . 132

## CHAPTER VII

### A NEW CURRENT IN THE MOVEMENT

1838-41

PAGE

Formation of a new school with directly Roman tendencies—Oakeley, Faber, Dalgairns, J. A. Froude, Seager, J. B. Morris—Description of their characteristics by the Dean of St. Paul's . . . . . 136

Difference between their starting point and that of the original leaders—Early history of the Tracts—Proposed return to the Anglicanism of Laud—*via media*—Tracts at first fly-leaves, afterwards treatises—Library of the Fathers—Catholicism of the *via media* disputed — This led to the Roman question . . . . . 138

Ward's school attracted to Rome and the Church Universal—Kept back from Rome by the Tracts—Love of Church authority and Catholic sanctity the marks of the new school . . 141

State of things which made the existence of a Roman party in the establishment possible—Two events mainly instrumental (1) the language used in the Preface to Froude's *Remains* by Newman and Keble about the Reformers; (2) Newman's secret doubt, raised by the Monophysite controversy, as to the validity of the Anglican position—His first disclosure of the doubt described by Henry Wilberforce . . 143

Rome allowed by Newman to have preserved what England had lost—Ward's study and dissemination of Roman books—Love of Jesuit ascetic and dogmatic writers—Of the scholastic method—Liturgy at Margaret Street—His views of ceremonial . . . . . 145

Suspicion of the Heads aroused—They fail to understand the depth of the Roman tendency—Their narrowness and ignorance — Dr. Faussett gives the signal for war — Attacks Newman and Keble . . . . . 147

Jowett's recollections of Ward's influence—"An age of young men"—Dean Church's reminiscences—"Bold and startling candour" . . . . . 149

Ward hopes for ultimate reunion—Sees that this must involve acceptance of the decrees of Trent—Circumstances leading to Tract 90—Tait's statement that "Ward worried Newman into writing it" . . . . . 150

Æsthetic Catholicism — Bloxam the "father of Ritualism" — Ward and Pugin—"What are mullions?"—Pugin's disgust at Ward's disregard for Gothic architecture—"Who could

PAGE

have thought that the glorious man whom I knew at Oxford could have fallen so miserably low?"—Rood screens and "rude" letters . . . . . 153

## CHAPTER VIII

### TRACT 90

### 1841

Ward's prophecy that Tract 90 would make a sensation—Newman incredulous—J. Mozley's account of first effects . 156

Protest of the four tutors, Tait, Churton, Wilson, and Griffiths—Resolution of the Hebdomadal Board—Newman acknowledges the authorship—His letter to Dr. Jelf in defence of the Tract—Message from the Bishop of Oxford—Cessation of the Tracts . . . . . 157

Newman accused of want of straightforwardness—Phrases introduced to pacify moderate Tractarians misunderstood—Wilson's letter—His references to Newman's "shifty" and "ambiguous" expressions . . . . . 160

Ward's pamphlets in defence of Tract 90—His explanation of Newman's meaning—Resents the charge brought against Newman of disingenuousness—His letter to Scott—He advocates fuller and more open discussion . . . 161

Mr. Lowe on "The Articles as construed by themselves"—His controversy with Ward—"A hateful verbal sophistry and mental reservation"—Ward's strong language about the Reformers—Their "rebellion" and "perjury" . . 169

Pusey's letter on Tract 90—Contrast between Ward and Newman's language—Ward invents the phrase "non-natural" sense—Recollections of Dean Church—Oakeley's pamphlet. . 171

Horror of Dr. Jenkyns at Ward's expressions—Ward's resignation of his lectureships—The Master disarmed—Anxiety of Ward's friends—Where was it to end?—Ward refuses to give Pusey a pledge that he will not join the Roman Church . . . . . 174

Ward's correspondence with Pusey (July 1841)—Claims Newman's sanction for all his views—Offers to give up anything Newman disapproves—Newman's doubts as to Anglican sacraments—Ward says he might have joined the Roman Church if Newman had not given up the Reformation—Could not have joined the Tractarians otherwise—He believes in practical corruptions of Romanism—Does not

PAGE

think Rome at present pure enough to justify a change of Communion — Corruption of Anglicanism more radical — Roman Church has preserved the ideal of saintliness — Anglicans have sneered at it as fanatical—Ward declares his reluctance in publishing his pamphlets — Grand bond among all their confidence in Newman . . . 176

CHAPTER IX

EVENTS SUCCEEDING TRACT 90

1841-1842.

Tract 90 marked an epoch in the Movement—Sense of persecution —Extreme party look openly to Rome for sympathy—Ward and Dalgairns write to the *Univers*— Appeal to foreign Churches for sympathy—Projected reunion—Mr. Hamilton Gray's reply . . . . . 185

Bloxam makes acquaintance with Mr. Lisle Phillipps—Introduces him to Ward—Visits to Oscott and Mount St. Bernard's— Ideas of reunion—Father Gentili and the Rosminians—Ward visits Mr. Phillipps—Delight in the Catholic liturgy . 190

Sibthorp's conversion — Letters from Ward to Mr. Phillipps — Advocates their working each in his own Church to purify it—Deprecates sectarianism in English Catholics, and their exclusive devotion to prosperity of their own body—Their failure to appreciate self-denial as such—Sibthorp's return to the Anglican Church—Ward's disgust—Points the moral or the unwisdom of hasty conversion . . . . 193

Newman's gradual retirement from active leadership—The three blows which "broke him"—Retires to Littlemore in 1842 . 202

Complex relations between Newman and Ward—Ward presses Newman for fuller statements—Difference of temperament and habits—Newman's suggestive and informal method— Ward's logical method—Ward's habits of discussion with men of all schools—His wish that they should understand each other — Newman's difficult position as leader of a party which was not homogeneous—Danger of breaking up the party if he identified himself with Ward's statements —His uncertainty whether his Roman conclusions were a delusion—His love for Anglicanism and for Pusey—Ward's indifference to everything except the solution of the problem before him—Sympathies and intellectual conclusions alike Roman—Failed to see that he annoyed Newman by pressing him forward . . . . . 203

PAGE

Pusey's friends accuse Ward of inconsiderateness — The Dean of St. Paul's on the effects on Newman of Ward's pressure —Feeling on the part of Liberals and friends of Ward as to Newman's over great reserve and subjectivity—Dean Stanley's recollections . . . . . 207

Newman's words to Pusey as to his relations with Ward—His expressed admiration of Ward's *British Critic* articles—Father Lochart's recollections of Newman's view on Anglican orders—Attitude towards Pusey and Ward . . . 209

## CHAPTER X

### THE ROMEWARD MOVEMENT

### 1842-1844.

New character in proceedings of the Movement—Newman's restraining hand removed—Ward's theory of the Anglican Church as a place of preparation for Roman Catholicism—"The whole cycle of Roman doctrine" tenable by Anglicans—Newman's rejection of the theory in its extreme form—His letters to Hope Scott . . . . . 211

Ward's influence during 1843-44 as described by Dean Bradley and Dean Stanley—His methods—Refuses to adopt wholesale the opinions of the party—Preserves the dialectical method first learned from Whately — Dean Church's description of Ward's discussions—Ward preserved the practical way of looking at religion which he first learned from Arnold—"All to the glory of God"—His sense of the ludicrous element in the ignoring of God's paramount claims—A "deferential" attitude towards the Creator . . . 213

Ceases to view the English Church as Catholic—"Not a Catholic, a Puseyite"—His attitude disapproved by older Tractarians —The *enfant terrible* of the party—Exaggerates his own ignorance of history—An exciting debate in which each side knew but one fact . . . . . 216

The *British Critic* Ward and Oakeley's *medium*—Ward owns to his style being "harsh, dry, and repulsive"—Mozley's surprise at one of Ward's articles being reckoned the "gem of the number"—Difficulties between Ward and his editor—Newman appealed to — Unconventional candour in Ward's writing—Explains that his references are all wrong as his copy of the book under review is "incorrectly bound up" . 218

Two elements in Ward's essays, (1) abstract theory as to method of discerning religious truth ; (2) his programme for the

PAGE

Movement — His programme involves reintroduction of Catholic ascetics—Hopes for ultimate submission to Rome—His tone implies submission of Anglicans to a foreign power rather than restoration to primitive Anglicanism—Early Tracts appeal to English *amour propre*—Ward constantly wounds it—"Our prostrate Church" . . 221

Theory of advance in religious knowledge—A spirit of belief and purity of intention—A truer creed answers the needs of a purified conscience—The spirit of a learner not of a judge—Free and critical inquiry violates the canons of induction—Phenomena of moral truth cannot be even apprehended in such a spirit—Subjective nature of all moral experience—Alleged grounds of belief often not real grounds—Alleged grounds of soldiers' or executioners' professions may be made to defend the horrors of the French Revolution — Unsatisfactory nature of alleged proofs for Theism—Summary condemnation of Mr. Goode . . . . 226

Ward refuses to suppress admiration of Rome for the sake of greater High Church unity—Unity of a national Church not a legitimate object of ultimate endeavour—Open defence of Roman doctrines and devotions—Annoyance of High Church party—Termination of the *British Critic* . . 233

Ward's sermons at Margaret Street and at Oxford—He and Oakeley refrain from preaching Roman doctrine—Ward preaches on the evangelical counsel of poverty—Bishop Blomfield takes him to task—The appeal to Scripture—Oakeley's article on auricular confession — Consequent acquaintance of Ward and Oakeley with Father Whitty—Visit to old Hall—"Newman my pope"—Ward admits the unsatisfactoriness of his position—"I am writing a fat book which will bring things to an issue" . . . 238

Animus aroused by Tract 90—Opposition to Isaac Williams's candidature for the Poetry professorship—His defeat—Pusey's sermon on "the Holy Eucharist a comfort to the Penitent"—Pusey's suspension—Ward hails with satisfaction the tumult and disorder in the Church—Protestantism a demon which will rend the body from which it is preparing to depart . 240

Bewilderment of moderate Churchmen at the Roman tendency—"Plausible reasoning of Jesuitism"—A college servant in doubt as to Anglican orders . . . . 242

Palmer of Worcester goes to Newman—Remonstrates on the *British Critic*—Newman refuses to interfere—Palmer writes his "Narrative" of the history of the Movement—Describes Ward's school with horror—Quotes a number of passages from the writings of Ward and Oakeley . . . 243

PAGE

Chorus in approval of Palmer's "Narrative"—Ward views it as a challenge — Writes the *Ideal of a Christian Church* — T. Mozley's account of the excitement it produced — "All England was moved" . . . . . 246

## CHAPTER XI

### THE IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH

*Ideal* originally projected as a pamphlet—Its growth *inter scribendum*—Irregular mode of composition—Fundamental conception that individual moral discipline is the only basis for Christian faith and life—The one object of an ideal Church to save souls . . . . . 248

Two conditions of sanctification and salvation: (1) faith, (2) obedience to God's will—Intimate connection between the two—Two chief Protestant principles lead to Agnosticism: (1) private judgment which results in uncertainty, (2) the emotional religion of evangelicals which identifies faith with subjective feeling—Catholic ideal of conscience submitting to an external law the antidote to both . . . 250

Ward asked the question now familiar, then not so:—Can man have knowledge of transcendental truth?—Identifies Religious and Moral truth—Maintains that at first sight from imperfections and contradictions in existing religious arguments and creeds such knowledge seems uncertain—Deeper view discloses reality of fundamental Moral truth — Existing religions to be purified, not destroyed—A divine truth contained in them but partially obscured . . . 251

This deeper view begins by noting the contrast between the reality revealed in conscience with mere intellect and with mere feeling—Sense of duty distinct from both—Gives a glimpse of something objective, evidently real, but only very partially apprehended—Reverent attention to this Objective Somewhat gives light to guide our own footsteps—This attitude is the attitude of Faith—Opposed to critical attitude of a judge—Opposed also to attention to subjective *feelings*—Leads to submitting and conforming the will to something *external*—Lutheran "assurance," as unconnected with effort to conform to external law gives no test whereby to distinguish between fancy and religious perception . . . . 253

Catholic Church commissioned to dispense to us so much of this Moral truth as we are fitted for—Undertakes also the individual training which is indispensable for the apprehension of that truth—The same training helps us to realise and act on what is revealed—Ward's own description of the functions

PAGE

of conscience—Of the Catholic Church as the home of such Moral truth as we may know . . . . . 256

Notes of the Church correspond to notes of Moral truth—Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity (made known by special providential revelation in time)—Sanctity the great note—Church to do corporately and systematically what other Christian teachers wish to do each in his way—Ward's general sketch of the "Ideal" Church . . . 258

The Church the home of the poor—Ideal Church must preserve Christian equality—Must rebuke manifest oppression on part of civil rulers—Must aid wise rulers, and set the example of loyalty . . . . . 264

Ward's "Ideal" partly coloured by his own special temperament and needs—His own need for exact external discipline and guidance peculiarly urgent—His own perception of logical consequences peculiarly keen—Much of his intensity of expression refers to *principles* and not to results visible at present—He recognises this himself—Many readers failed to understand it . . . . . 266

Ward's full plea of guilty to Palmer's charges—Insists that Palmer attacked him most fairly from his own point of view—Defence of his own tone—Of his patriotism—Spurious patriotism of many—"Base pride and vulgar nationality"—Indifferent to charge of intellectual over-confidence—Conscious of moral shortcomings . . . . . 268

Ward pleads practically for restoration of Catholic ideal and aims—Mainly the ascetic ideal—Let all join in this and in reforming corruptions—Leave the results to God—Intellectual confusion of Anglicanism from its inclusion of Protestant and Catholic formularies—Reaction of this in its moral tone—Existing elements of Protestantism render Catholic asceticism difficult of introduction—He maintains that ultimate result of Catholic asceticism would be submission to Rome . 272

Ward's open and strong statements on Anglican inconsistency—Wholesale denunciation of powerlessness of the Establishment against existing evils—Of self-satisfaction of English Churchmen—The confessional a wholesome discipline for the rich and powerful—Want of moral activity in the Establishment . . . . . 276

Moral inactivity of English Church due greatly to prevalence of the spirit implied in Luther's doctrine of justification—Ward's denunciations of it as an abstract doctrine—Statement that it only partially affects even evangelicals—Contrast between Scriptural ideal of prayer and struggle and Lutheran "ideal"

PAGE

—Trusts he has denounced that ideal in "terms not wholly inadequate to its prodigious demerits" . . . 282

Catholic asceticism the antithesis to Lutheranism—Rome has preserved this untouched—To reform a Roman Catholic country you act by *means* of the system you find, in England you act by attacking it—Plea for combination among all High Churchmen against Lutheran and in favour of Catholic ideal —Leave results to Providence—States his own conviction as to those results—Vision in the future—Anglicans "suing humbly at the feet of Rome for pardon and restoration" . 286

Final exhortation to all men of good will to combine, irrespective of speculative opinions, in restoring the principles of Faith and Obedience . . . . . 288

NOTE.—On Rule of Life in a French Ecclesiastical Seminary . 289

## CHAPTER XII

### CONSEQUENCES OF THE IDEAL

1844

*Ideal* appears at a critical time—Opposition of Tractarians to appointment of B. P. Symons as Vice-Chancellor—Their overwhelming defeat—Horror of average Churchmen at the *Ideal*—Interest taken in it by intellectual men of various schools, Mill, Comte, Döllinger, Sir W. Hamilton, Keble—Newman disappointed in it—Mr. Gresley expresses the opinion of moderate Churchmen on it . . . 293

Gladstone's article on the *Ideal* in the *Quarterly*—Its scope—Fails to understand Ward's contention that religious truth cannot be proved by the secular intellect . . . 297

Correspondence of Mill and Comte on the *Ideal*—Comte's pleasure at Ward's recognition that the dilemma lay between Catholicism and infidelity . . . . . 302

Mischief brewing among the Heads—Proposed proceedings against Ward—Their accidental disclosure to Bloxam of Magdalene —Ward summoned before the Vice-Chancellor—Publication of proposed proceedings against him—Acknowledges authorship of the work, and accepts responsibility of its sentiments —Text of Ward's letters to the Vice-Chancellor and of the proposed measures . . . . . 303

Excitement at proposed measures—The proposed test endangers existence of the High Church party—Dean Stanley's recollections—Protest of the Liberals . . . . . 310

PAGE

Tait's letter to the Vice-Chancellor—Protests against the test—Approves Ward's punishment—Vindicates Ward's good faith 312

Moberly's letter to Dr. Jenkyns of Balliol—Opposes the whole of the proceedings—His testimony to Ward's high character 315

Keble's defence of Ward—Admiration of parts of the *Ideal* . 316

Frederick Maurice's two letters against Ward's condemnation—Development *versus* accumulation . . . . . 318

Gladstone's letters to S. Wilberforce — Opposes the proposed measures—Insists on intrinsic difficulties of the test . 323

Scene between Ward and Dr. Jenkyns on SS. Simon and Jude's day, 1844—"Certain men crept in unawares" . . 325

## CHAPTER XIII

### CONDEMNATION OF MR. WARD

### 1845

Partial reaction in Ward's favour—Ward's published address to Convocation—Declares that all parties subscribe in a "non-natural sense"—Low Churchmen must subscribe the Prayer-book "non-naturally"—Withdrawal of the test—Prebendary Garbett maintains this withdrawal to be shirking Ward's challenge as to the principle of subscription—Refuses to vote against Ward . . . . . 326

Requisition to Vice-Chancellor requesting condemnation of Tract 90—Vice-Chancellor adds this to the other proposed measures—Stanley's fly-leaf on coincidences between the cases of Ward and Hampden . . . . . 333

Stanley's description of the great day of condemnation—Scene in the Sheldonian Theatre—Distinguished assembly—Accounts of other eye-witnesses—Ward allowed to speak in English—Opening of his speech—Its unconciliatory tone—*Ideal* condemned by large majority—Degradation passed by a smaller majority—Condemnation of Tract 90 proposed—Guillemard and Church, the proctors, interpose their *veto* . . 336

Legal proceedings projected—Ward's first meeting with Archdeacon Manning—Ward's indifference to his condemnation—His comic rhymes on the proceedings—Moral effect in Ward's favour described by a contemporary . . . 343

PAGE

Newman writes to Ward on his condemnation—Ward's letter to the Vice-Chancellor, challenging the legality of the proceedings . . . . . 346

## CHAPTER XIV

### COLLAPSE OF THE MOVEMENT

### 1845-1846

Ward's engagement to Miss Wingfield—Doubts as to his vocation—Newman favours his marriage—Annoyance of the High Church party—Anti-Roman decisions of Ecclesiastical Courts—The stone altar case—Oakeley sued by the Bishop of London in the Court of Arches—He declines to defend—Roman doctrines condemned *seriatim*—Ward's letter to Pusey in Oakeley's defence . . . . . 348

Fetters binding Ward to English Church gradually unlocked—He begins an article on Blanco White—Mrs. Ward copies it for press—Determines to join the Church—Ward feels that his own time has at last come—Before taking the final step he circulates a letter among his friends giving his grounds for change, and inviting criticism . . . . . 356

Text of Ward's letter—His remaining an Anglican based on two reasons—Both have ceased to exist—(1) Anglican Authorities have denied the tenableness of Roman doctrine in the Church of England—(2) Newman has ceased to feel that a stricter life increases his trust in Anglican ordinances—Importance of a living, energising, dogmatic system . . . . 360

Mr. and Mrs. Ward received by Father Brownbill in Bolton Street—Pasquinades from Oxford—"O Wardie, I believed thee true" . . . . . 365

Father Whitty visits them at Rose Hill, Oxford—Simplicity of life—"Like the early Christians"—A haunch of venison—Confirmation by Wiseman at Oscott—Pugin builds a small house at Old Hall for the Wards . . . . . 366

Oakeley's proof of the divinity of the Church, "a Church which could tame and keep in order Ward and me"—Pusey's lamentations—"All the converts have deteriorated except Newman and Ward"—With Ward "further deterioration impossible"—Renewal of friendship with old Oxford friends—A passage at arms with Goulburn—Happiest days of Ward's life when teaching at Old Hall—Letter to Cardinal Wiseman . . . . . 367

## CHAPTER XV

### THE OXFORD SCHOOL AND MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

PAGE

Explanation of scope of the chapter . . . . . 370

Bearing of the Movement on the controversy between the Anglican and Catholic Churches . . . . . 376

Bearing of the philosophy of Newman and Ward, and the general principles maintained by the Oxford school, on some recent currents of thought . . . . . 380

APPENDIX A.—Sermon by Ward, 1837 . . . . . 407

APPENDIX B.—Sermon by Ward, 1839 . . . . . 417

APPENDIX C.—Recollections of Ward, by the Rev. W. C. Lake, Dean of Durham . . . . . 423

APPENDIX D.—Recollections of Ward and of the Oxford Movement, by Professor Jowett, Master of Balliol, . 428

APPENDIX E.—Typical specimens of the interpretations advocated in Tract 90 . . . . . 440

APPENDIX F.—Selections from the *Apologia* . . . . 442

APPENDIX G.—Extracts from the *Ideal of a Christian Church*, illustrating lines of thought already referred to . . 445

APPENDIX H.—Text of the test proposed in 1844 by the Heads of Houses . . . . . 459

APPENDIX I.—Selections from A. P. Stanley's letters referring to Ward's early relations with Newman and with himself . 461

STANFORD LIBRARY

# CHAPTER I

## BOYHOOD OF WILLIAM GEORGE WARD

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD was born in London on 21st March 1812. His father, Mr. William Ward, was the second son of Mr. George Ward of Northwood Park, Isle of Wight, and was well known in his day as Tory member for the city of London (which he represented from 1826 to 1835), and as a director of the Bank of England. He was a considerable authority on matters of finance, and in 1830, at the special request of the Duke of Wellington, he assumed the duties of chairman of the Parliamentary Committee appointed to investigate the affairs of the East India Company, preparatory to the opening of the China trade. Mr. William Ward was, perhaps, still better known, in a very different sphere, as a famous cricketer, the proprietor of Lord's cricket ground, and the most successful batsman of his day. He scored 278 in 1820 for the M.C.C. against Norfolk, the largest score ever made at Lord's in a first-class match.

The family of Ward settled in the Isle of Wight rather more than a century ago, and the squire of Northwood has been for four generations the owner of very considerable landed property in the island and in Hampshire. Their immediate ancestors had resided in Gibraltar—the grandfather of the first Mr. Ward of Northwood having taken part in the memorable siege of that fortress in 1704, and subsequently died in the garrison. The first member of the family who settled in England was Mr. John Ward, who had held for many years the appointments of chief clerk of the Ordnance and Paymaster to the forces under General Cornwallis, Governor of Gibraltar, having early in life acquired some fortune as a Spanish

merchant.[1] He had married in 1749 a Spanish lady named Raphael, of a family originally from Genoa, and some have traced a connection between the element of Spanish blood thus introduced into the family, and the intensity and enthusiasm of temperament which characterised the subject of this memoir. Several of Mr. John Ward's descendants were well known in the political and diplomatic world. His youngest son Robert Plumer Ward, of Gilston Park in Hertfordshire, the author of *Tremaine*, and of the *History of the Law of Nations*, was for some twenty years a member of successive Tory ministries. He was a friend and *protegé* of the younger Pitt, and began his official career in 1805 as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, the Chief-Secretary at that time being his brother-in-law Lord Mulgrave. He afterwards filled successively the posts of Lord of the Admiralty, Clerk of the Ordnance, and Auditor of the Civil List. Another member of the Ward family whose public career may be referred to as distinguished was Sir Henry Ward, G.C.M.G., Mr. Plumer Ward's only son. Sir Henry Ward was first brought into prominence in 1823 as Minister Plenipotentiary for acknowledging the Mexican Republic. For a short time in 1846 he joined Lord John Russell's Ministry as Secretary to the Admiralty, but in 1849 he was appointed Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Isles. In 1856 he was made Governor of Ceylon, and he died in 1860 as Governor of Madras.[2]

The mother of William George Ward was Miss Emily Combe, daughter of Mr. Harvey Combe of Cobham Park, M.P. for the city of London at the beginning of the present century, and head of the well-known firm of brewers, Combe & Delafield. Her brother was the sportsman of the same name, who

[1] The large landed property belonging to the family at the end of the last century and early in the present was acquired partly by the eldest son of Mr. John Ward—Mr. George Ward of Northwood—a very eminent merchant, who purchased the Isle of Wight and Hampshire estates referred to in the text; and partly by the marriage of Mr. John Ward's youngest son Robert to the heiress of the Hertfordshire estates of the family of Plumer. This lady—Mrs. Plumer-Lewin—was one of the Hamilton family, granddaughter of James, seventh Earl of Abercorn, who had married a daughter of Colonel John Plumer, M.P. for Herts.

[2] A good many of the particulars here referred to will be found more fully in the "Memoir of R. Plumer Ward," by his nephew, the Hon. E. Phipps. London, 1850.

was for a lengthened term a popular master of hounds in Surrey.

Of the early home life of William George Ward a few characteristic details are preserved. His tastes were, even as a child, very marked, and his likes and dislikes very intense. He had a passion for music and the drama, and for mathematics. He detested (as he would express it) general society, —such as he at that time came in contact with, and which had in it no distinctively intellectual or interesting element. Those who remember him as a boy describe the delight with which he looked forward to the play, his complete absorption in it, the accuracy with which he remembered and detailed every scene and much of the dialogue after it was over. When he was very young, the reaction at the fall of the curtain and on his return to the dulness of everyday life, made him sometimes cry from depression of spirits. He could not endure the absence of active occupation for his mind, even for a few minutes; and between the acts of the play he would read, the book chosen being generally some work on mathematics. This habit he kept up to the end of his life. His early interest in the theatre was not confined to the play alone, but extended to all connected with it. He knew the names not only of the principal actors but of the supernumeraries, and would note with interest how Mr. Smith or Mr. Jones, who played first footman or policeman, had gone from the Haymarket to Covent Garden. During his spare time he worked for hours together at mathematics, being especially interested in original speculation in them. When he was nine years old his mother, who was herself a great mathematician, on looking at one of his note-books, covered with figures, declared that he had found out the principle of Logarithms, and had applied it for himself with considerable skill.

On the other hand, those who remember seeing him only in general society describe him as a clumsy-looking boy, often sitting apart from the rest of the company, biting his nails, seldom opening his mouth, and looking generally "bored to death." Once when staying with his relations at Cobham Park he was taken to a children's dance in the neighbourhood, much against his will, and on being asked by his hostess how

he was enjoying himself, replied with the utmost bluntness, "I expected to find it a bore, but now that I am here I find it even worse than I had thought." Before the evening was over his *ennui* had reached an intensity past endurance, and without waiting for the end of the party he made his way home alone through the muddy roads and pelting rain, and arrived wet through, his evening shoes covered with dirt, and generally in a very sorry plight, but intensely relieved to have got away at any cost. His uncle had pity on him, and never asked him to go to another party.

At the age of eight he was sent to a private school at Eagle House, Brookgreen, Hammersmith. He does not appear to have distinguished himself much; and the only episode in his life there which may be worth relating was an act of rebellion against one of the masters, in which we may see traces of the public spirit and hatred of tyranny which characterised him later on.

There was a practice in vogue at the school of compelling the boys during certain stated hours to talk nothing but French. The rule was not enforced with such strictness as would have made it really useful. A piece of paper called "the mark" was given to the first boy who said a word of English; and he was at liberty to pass it on to any one whom he, in turn, heard speaking in any language other than French. Whoever was found in possession of the mark at the end of the appointed time, had a heavy imposition. Ward thought it very unfair that this one unlucky individual, often not the worst offender, should stand scapegoat for the sins of his brethren, and considered the whole rule absurd and tyrannical. Directly therefore the French-talking time commenced, he began to talk English in a loud voice. He was presented with the "mark," which he put into his pocket. "Now," he said, "you may all talk English as much as you please, for *I do not intend to pass the mark on.*" The French master, finding Ward day after day for two weeks in possession of the mark, tried to persuade the boys not to pass it on, but to tell him directly Ward spoke English. The boys, however, would not do this, and the master's next endeavour was to bully Ward into giving way, pulling his hair and twisting his wrist in true French fashion. Ward remained firm, however,

and the head-master, fearing, if the war were continued, to lose his younger brothers, Henry and Matthew, who were going to school the following term, caused the rule to be changed; and Ward remained master of the field.

In 1823 he left Eagle House, and went to Winchester as a commoner. Dr. Gable was at that time headmaster. He numbered among his contemporaries there many men afterwards distinguished in public life, among whom may be mentioned Robert Lowe (afterwards Lord Sherbrooke), Roundell Palmer (afterwards Lord Selborne), Edward Cardwell (Lord Cardwell), Anthony Trollope, Sir Eardley Wilmot, William Monsell (now Lord Emly).

His schooldays were not happy; they were, indeed, as he often said, the least happy period of his life. He had little aptitude for games, and his interest in discussion and speculation, (which existed even in his boyhood) found no scope among his companions. He used to say of himself, "I never was a boy," and Lord Selborne, in the sketch he has kindly written for me of those days, says, "he was not like other boys, even in the commonest things." His Latin scholarship was excellent, and the standard at Winchester was then very high. In 1829 he gained the gold medal for Latin prose composition, against such competitors as Roundell Palmer, Robert Lowe, and Eardley Wilmot. Lord Selborne has written the following recollections of his schoolboy days, showing that in many points of character "the boy was father to the man." "I have seldom known any man," he writes, "whose character, temper, simplicity and kindliness of disposition, directness and keenness of intellect . . . suffered so little change during so long a time." The reminiscences are, however, equally remarkable for the absence of any indication of those social and conversational gifts of which his Oxford friends speak so enthusiastically at a later period.

"Our families had been on friendly terms for two generations. His father's elder brother, Mr. George Henry Ward, occupied Shawford House at Twyford, near Winchester, in 1825; and when my father took me, in July of that year, to be an unsuccessful candidate at the annual election for Winchester College, we were his guests. I went into 'Commoners' in the following autumn, being then nearly thirteen. William George Ward was also a commoner.

. . . I was placed in the same form with him, the 'Senior part of the Fifth,' just above fagging; and his uncle commended me to his good offices. I used often to go to Shawford House with him on holidays, and sometimes also for an early (and to us luxurious) breakfast from 'Morning Hills'—a peculiar Winchester institution of those days, now discontinued. The boys were marched twice a week (weather permitting) to the top of St. Catherine's hill (a mile from the college) for two hours before their first ordinary meal, not without benefit to those who had the privilege of furnishing them with less regular supplies. Arrived there those who (like Ward and myself) had 'leave of hills' from some prefect, wandered over the neighbouring downs and valleys, sometimes as far as Twyford. The rest, poor fellows, had to amuse themselves as well as they could within the entrenchments on the top of the hill. In this and in other ways I came to see a good deal of Ward, though he was not on ordinary occasions one of my most frequent companions. Our tastes were different. He was very fond of music (for which I had no ear), singing continually, after his fashion, snatches of airs from popular operas, catches, or glees: he had a turn for mathematics and I for natural history, to each of which interests the other of us was by nature or bent of mind inaccessible. He despised, or affected to despise, poetry and romance, which were to me most attractive. Besides which, I was younger and his inferior in bodily growth and strength.

"He did what he could to help me in my noviciate, which, however, was not much. Physically he was strong; but in point of physical courage he was passive, and content if he could follow his own ways quietly, without caring much for those of others. In appearance ponderous, in manners brusque and eccentric,—he was no cultivator of the graces, and was not at his ease in strange society. These singularities made him often the subject of practical jokes, as when one of the boys sent him one day an invitation to dine with the Bishop of Hereford (Huntingford), then Warden of the College. It never occurred to him to suspect a trick. He was made miserable for the whole day by the anticipated terrors of Episcopacy and young ladies; asked everybody he met what he ought to do under all the various emergencies he conjured up . . . and at last was inexpressibly relieved when, on presenting himself at the appointed time and place, a servant told him that the Bishop had dined some hours before, and that he was not expected. For the greater part of his time at school he did not care for the games, though his weight and strength eventually made him useful at football. But with all his oddities, his imperturbable good humour and the sterling honesty of his character made him generally liked; to which, perhaps, his father's reputation as a popular Wykehamist, Tory member for the city of London, and also a famous cricketer,

and the hospitable entertainer of the Winchester eleven when they went up annually for the public school matches at Lords', contributed. There were seemingly contradictory elements in his character which made him always good company. He had a pleasure in paradox and a keen sense of the ludicrous, and far from being offended or mortified at the amusement others found in his peculiarities, he was quite capable of entering into a joke at his own expense. . . . There was a custom called 'pealing' practised by the junior boys on their seniors at a certain time of the year, on their going into the large schoolroom for lessons before the arrival of their masters. The juniors assembled together at one end of the room, shouted out upon the appearance of each object of their attentions some characteristic salutation. Ward, when a prefect, was saluted with the 'peal,' 'Three three-halfpenny oranges, a bun and a halfpenny fig,' in memory of his habitually exact distribution of sixpence in eatables sold at the gate before going into morning school."

Another who remembered those days told me that, whereas most of the prefects were rather shy of exposing themselves to this ordeal, and would come in as late as possible, and if they could unobserved, in order to avoid these remarks on their personal characteristics, Ward, who was quite as much amused at his own peculiarities as any one else, entered the room purposely early, and roared with laughter at each fresh sally at his expense.

His memory was very remarkable, and he would learn, for his own amusement, hundreds of lines over and above the ordinary amount which was demanded by the masters. Many of the poems so learnt he could repeat till the end of his life. He is described as unfailingly accurate both in memory and in his mathematical work, and as perfectly sure of himself in these departments. "I don't know why it is," he said on one occasion to his mathematical tutor, who found fault with his answer to some problem, "but when I see that my answer to a sum is right, I don't care if all the world says it's wrong. I *know* it's right." And right it proved to be in the event. On the other hand, where he did not entirely grasp a subject he would have nothing to do with it, and declared himself wholly incompetent to give any opinion on it or to deal with it in any way. Original verse-making was required at Winchester, and Ward said that he had no poetry in him, and quite refused to work at it seriously. He was compelled to write the appointed

task, but he purposely made his own contributions as grotesque as possible, and read them aloud, when finished, to his schoolfellows, amid much laughter.

"He was ostentatiously indifferent to verse-making," writes Lord Selborne, "an exercise much valued in those days at all public schools, and not least at Winchester, for the cultivation of the imagination and taste, and of the faculties of memory, observation, and criticism. To some of us (myself among the number) it operated as a powerful stimulus to exertion, and supplied motives for interest, and for voluntary work beyond the prescribed lessons, which might otherwise have been wanting. But it was not so with Ward. Twenty lines were the minimum required in our part of the school for an ordinary 'verse-task;' which was, or was expected to be, an original composition in Latin verse upon a given subject. Ward never exceeded that minimum. His Latin and his prosody were probably as correct as anybody else's; but he seemed to study the quaintest and most prosaic treatment of his subject, whatever it might be; and no termination could be too bald and abrupt when the necessary number of lines had been accomplished. Nor did he depart from these principles in the larger and more elaborate compositions which he was obliged to write when in the Sixth Form, on the subjects annually set for the king's gold medals. In 1828 we had to write Latin Hexameters on the Temple of Jupiter Ammon."

Ward commenced his composition, after the two introductory lines, by fervently disclaiming all pretensions to the poetic faculty in a parody on the well-known lines of Horace:—

> "In Libya tenuit Templum ingens Jupiter Ammon
> Cujus origo fuit quam nunc ex ordine pangam.
> Ast primum illorum dederim quibus esse poetis
> Excerpam numero *me*. Versus scribere cogor."

"Versifying what he found about the temple in books," continues Lord Selborne, "he made mention of certain medals struck by Alexander the Great, on his visit to it, and thus concluded:

> "'Queis tamen ah quanto quanto potiora medalla,
> Queis caput impositum est quod magnus Wiccamus[1] olim
> Gestabat, meriti nunc premia semper amata.
> Non jam prima peto neque elatus vincere certo;
> Quanquam Oh! Sed vincant qui carminibus mereantur.'

"In the next year a gold medal was given for English verses on

[1] "The head of William of Wykeham was on the obverse of the prize medals."

'The Spanish Captives sacrificed to the Mexican God of War.' He began his medal task with a characteristic pun:—

> "'Far from a merry key I now must sing,
> Though to America my muse takes wing—'

and then proceeded—

> "'Long had the Spaniards crossed the watery way
> And reached the fields of bright America.
> Long since had Cortes, glorying in might
> And caring little for another's right,
> Both planned and tried to execute his plans
> Against the unoffending Mexicans.
> What had they done to him the savage man
> That he against their liberty should plan?
> Nothing at all; but he both wanted gold
> And fame: no other motive are we told—'

with a good deal more of the same quality."

The commencement of his poem on "The Hebrides" is another characteristic specimen of his English verses—

> "There are some islands in the Northern seas
> —At least I'm told so—called the Hebrides."

And a little later a peculiar feature of a certain barbarous nation is thus referred to:—

> "These people have but very little wood;
> They therefore can't build ships. They wish they could."

One other passage from the verse exercises remembered by his contemporaries may be quoted—the culmination of a poem on the "Mariner's Compass." After giving an extremely prosaic account, with dates and names, of the history of its invention, he proceeds thus to the further question of its description:—

> "But now, alas! my hardest task draws near:
> I must attempt it, though the attempt I fear.
> For who can worthily describe in rhyme
> This useful instrument, this art sublime?
> In vain with the best invention would one try
> To understand it *without* sight of eye:
> And he that's seen it surely will not need
> That I explain in word what he has seen in deed.
> But yet unwillingly at last I'll try."

At this point he found that only three lines more were wanted

to complete the *minimum* quantity required, and so he thus abruptly concluded :—

> "The various points and quarters of the sky
> Are painted on a card beneath a hole.
> Atop 's a magnet pointing to the pole."

Side by side with the more amusing and eccentric features which were the first to attract the attention of his schoolboy companions, there was even at this early period a very strong element of religious earnestness and serious thought. This side of his character disclosed itself on occasion to the general public; but he so disliked the slightest pretence or display in such matters, that the extent of its existence was known to very few—chiefly to his eldest sister Emily, to whom he was deeply attached. He used to tell her that he always felt that the one ambition worth having was the promotion of the cause of God in this world; and his tone of mind as a schoolboy seems to have closely resembled that which Dr. Arnold developed a little later among his pupils at Rugby. He looked to a clerical career as his ultimate destination, and I have now before me pages of his note-books which were made the receptacles of his day-dreaming at school, and in which are written, side by side with the names of his favourite actors and singers, Mr. O. Smith and Mr. Philips, such sentences as "I remain, my dear sir, yours faithfully, W. G. Winton," or "Believe me, yours truly, W. G. Oxon."

Though his habits of piety were irregular his mind seemed ever to dwell on religion, and his sympathy was aroused by piety, even in those who were otherwise most uninteresting. His sisters had a governess who, from all that can be learned of her, seems to have been commonplace, plain, and dull. The element of evangelical piety in her instructions, however, so drew William George Ward to her, and he sought her society so much, that his mother used to say that he was in love with her. A deep sense of the moral purpose of life, together with the absence in him of a schoolboy's lighter interests, and the consequent habit of unceasing reflection on all around him, led to a horror at the immorality prevalent at Winchester, startling in its degree to most of those who conversed with him on the subject. The effects of this early impres-

sion remained quite unmitigated up to the day of his death.

He loved even in his schoolboy days abstract discussion and reasoning, though the spirit of Winchester school gave this taste little scope or encouragement. And the contrast between his quick perceptions in such matters as mathematics or ethical speculation, or in the details of the ideal world which absorbed him in the drama, and his lack of observation in the concrete affairs of life, was remarkable from the first. Indeed, it was the more noticeable in early days, from the fact that a boy's observation of the things about him is generally constant and keen. His ignorance of natural objects was such that a story is told of his asking, when a boy of twelve years old, what he was eating, and of his saying on being told that it was a sole, "It is very nice; where do they grow?" The following extract from an essay written when he was barely sixteen, though not free from the usual faults of a schoolboy's writing, sufficiently testifies to habits of abstract and consecutive thought unusual at so early an age. The subject for discussion was "Simplicity is essential to true greatness."

"Now greatness is so indeterminate a notion, it is one which so much depends in each man's mind on his particular genius and disposition, that it appears extremely difficult to refer it to any standard whatever. Mr. Burke, in speaking of a subject even more uncertain and anomalous, has expressed this opinion, 'I have no great opinion of a definition, the celebrated remedy for the cure of this disorder; for when we define we seem in danger of circumscribing nature within the bounds of our own notions.' But as he has not scrupled to deviate from his own opinion, and has given a definition the most clear and comprehensive, I hope I shall be excused if in a subject less fluctuating and abstruse, I venture to propose a formula which may embrace in some degree the different lights in which this idea may be viewed. I think that that seems in general most to approach true greatness, which inspires in us admiration, mixed with a certain degree of awe and reverence, and this I think cannot exist without simplicity.

"For to excite any degree of reverence an instantaneous effect must be felt; the impression must strike at once or it will lose its power; and this can surely never take place when the mind is, as it were, lost in a multiplicity of surrounding objects. There is nothing more truly noble and admirable than a common clock; yet at first sight I imagine that it inspires no one with either awe or admiration. Our eye wanders from wheel to wheel, from spring

to spring, without being able to fix its attention on any one point: our mind is bewildered in the mighty labyrinth; all seems perplexity and confusion. Now, if by a closer investigation of the construction of this machine, and by the instruction of some able mechanist, we by degrees obtain a fuller insight into the method and arrangement of its several parts, if we at length entirely comprehend the complicated working of wheel within wheel, chain connected to chain, and perceive the necessary relation which each in its particular office bears to the whole, we shall without doubt be sensible of the highest feeling of admiration for the wonderful ingenuity, the almost incredible nicety of mechanism which it displays. But beyond this our feelings will not go; we shall have no idea of reverence or awe in beholding that whose properties we have gradually discovered, and with which we have been long familiarised before we are thoroughly acquainted.

"It is upon this principle that nothing can be great in architecture which is covered with a great variety of decorations, although introduced most tastefully and in a manner the most agreeable to the tenor of the building; for the eye cannot at once arrange this multitude of objects so as to fall in uniformly with the design; and by the time that it has taken in the general purport, the opportunity is lost for that instantaneous impression which, as I have said, is essential to a feeling of awe. And indeed, although proportion of parts has been by some imagined to be requisite for beauty, I have never heard of any opinion that it at all constitutes greatness.

"It appears to me that Homer has described Nestor as a much greater man than Ulysses, nay, I very much doubt if this latter can lay any claim to that character. We are not particularly struck by his first appearance, but when we follow him through all his actions (I speak now of the Odyssey) and perceive one uniform spirit of wisdom and cunning inspire them, when we find him not performing a single act, scarcely uttering a single word, without some concealed and ulterior purpose, we are filled with admiration at the boundless extent of his forethought and judgment; but whilst by a process of the mind we arrive at this conclusion, we entirely lose that immediate perception which I have lately mentioned. In Nestor, on the other hand, from the very first we behold with reverence the mellowed wisdom of age, by its experience directing the counsels and moderating the ardour of more youthful warriors, heard with respect and obeyed with alacrity. We may in the same manner draw a distinction between Philip, King of Macedon, and his son Alexander. To the former, on the same principle as to Ulysses, I should deny the character of a great man; but I think Alexander, from the singleness of his character, fairly deserved the name he has handed down to pos-

terity. On turning to literature we find that Horace has been censured by Blair for the following stanza :—

'Arma
Nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus
Periculosae plenum opus aleae
Tractas, et incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso'—

as being crowded with three distinct metaphors, which, although upon consideration discovered to be perfectly congruous with the subject, yet by their intricacy disturb and obscure the effect of the whole.

"In this point of view alone, therefore, in every subject simplicity is essential to true greatness; but I think that this quality derives no small portion of its effect from a certain vagueness (if I may be allowed the word) which arises from it, where the limits not being defined with any precision, no determinate idea arises in the mind; for we feel infinitely the greatest awe at that whose nature and dimensions we do not exactly understand, and seldom regard anything as great whose boundaries we instantly perceive. I may be understood more clearly by an example. Lord Kane has said that a circle is the most admirable from being the simplest of all figures; and Mr. Burke, that it is most capable of exciting the idea of greatness. The reason that he gives is this, that it has what he calls a species of artificial infinity, and that turn which way you will you can nowhere fix a boundary. The celebrated criticism of Longinus on the words at the beginning of Genesis: 'And God said, let there be light, and there was light,' is well known, but I have always thought that this passage, besides its admirable expression of the immediate power of God's command, derives some of its greatness from the incomprehensibleness of the idea. It is above our ideas to conceive first the total darkness spread over the whole world, and then the sudden appearance of an instantaneous flood of light; nothing minute and circumstantial is introduced to divert or relieve the mind; we have but a confused notion of the whole, and this very confusedness is a principal cause of sublimity and greatness. And this consideration may perhaps serve to soften an objection that may be made to a former part of this theory, and indeed to the proposition itself that simplicity is essential to true greatness. There are few things which excite in us greater and more sublime ideas than the sky thickly studded with stars. This has, I believe, been accounted for by a modern writer by supposing that, as we see the stars but in one point of view and as blended one with another, it may justly be called a simple object. But as it is evident that the more we become acquainted with the complex and intricate motions of these several bodies, round themselves and with each

other, the greater awe we feel in beholding them, this supposition, I think, can hardly stand. I should be disposed to account for it in this way. In the case of the clock mentioned above we become by instruction fully masters of the subject; we understand the dependence which the whole has on each particular part, and we perceive the means of their connection with each other. But in this case, we are instructed in the science, and perhaps as far as the limits of the human faculties allow, comprehend it; but we do not see the means of action, and it is impossible for the mind to embrace the idea of myriads of worlds, some wandering their prescribed and regular course round the sun, others, at a far greater distance, themselves the centres of motion, about which other planets, to us invisible, revolve through the vast infinity of space,—all this I say the mind of man cannot conceive; and this, if there be not anything (as in the case of the clock) to distract the attention, will cause a very strong feeling of awe; the extreme greatness in this particular counterbalancing the want of immediate perception. Now, in my opinion, the sensation caused by viewing the sky itself interspersed with stars, with reference to and perhaps without knowledge of the principles and method of their action, is totally different from that inspired by the consideration of their wonderful movements and tremendous greatness. The former is an affection of the eye, and may be justly explained by the opinion which I mentioned above; but the latter is purely conversant with the mind, and our clear understanding of their several relations prevents distraction of the mind, whilst our indistinct perception of them much increases their greatness. But I must return from this long digression. The march of Neptune in the thirteenth book of the Iliad has been justly celebrated as a truly great idea; it is impossible for anything to be more simple, and I think that no small part of its grandeur arises from this same cause of indistinctness. In the whole of that ode of Horace where he celebrates the graces of Pyrrha, I know nothing so expressive as that simple and indefinite phrase, 'Simplex munditiis.' Mr. Burke has finely observed that nothing in any author gives us a higher idea of the beauty of Helen, from all the splendid eulogiums which have been pronounced on that celebrated female, than that passage in the Iliad where, upon seeing Helen approach at a distance, Priam's old and venerable counsellors, far beyond the reach of youthful passion, burst into exclamation :—

"'Οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
Τοιῇδ ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν.'

There is nothing defined here, the passage has the greatest simplicity, yet I question if the famous picture by Zeuxis ever caused such a high idea of her personal beauty.

"From all that has been said we may collect this, that in every

subject, in literature, in architecture, and even in morality, although simplicity of style may degenerate into negligence, of building into nakedness, no true greatness can exist without it; let ornaments then be to the fabric what jewels are to beauty, imperceptible additions to the whole effect, not themselves the principal objects of attraction."

The element of geniality and *bonhomie*, which was through life characteristic of him, made the monitorial duties of the sixth form distasteful to him. His ideas of discipline, and of his own duty in enforcing it, were very strict and high, and those who remember the peculiarly sympathetic traits in his character can best appreciate how much he was tried by the strained relations between the prefects (as they were called) and the rest of the boys in 1828. He himself in later life often spoke of his duties as prefect as particularly uncongenial; and it was in keeping with his general character that this very fact should make him all the more strict with himself in their exact performance.

Lord Selborne thus describes the system of "prefects" as it existed at Winchester in those days:—

"There were then 130 boys in 'commoners,' of whom the first eight, according to their rank in the school, were prefects. The prefects were entrusted by the headmaster with the general maintenance of discipline among the boys when no master was present; and in return had certain recognised rights to services from the boys below the 'senior part of the fifth,' and power to inflict punishment (within customary and reasonable limits), for breaches of discipline and acts of insubordination. The popular notion, which identifies this system (common under various forms and modifications to all our great public schools) with tyranny or 'bullying,' is much mistaken. The existence of such a recognised authority, with its concurrent responsibility, in some of the elder boys of a great school, is (on the contrary) a valuable safeguard against serious evils, which no amount of supervision on the part of masters or tutors could go far to check, and (amongst others) against tyranny, by the brute force of the strong over the weak. But it is essential for the success of this system, that the boys entrusted with power should be able in general to hold their own physically as well as morally; and should not be too much dependent on the mere authority of their office, and the support of the masters. This was especially the case in 'commoners' at Winchester at the time of which I speak. Except on holidays or part-holidays (of which there were two in each week), one hour only of the day was spent in the

playground, or beyond the walls of the school buildings; all the rest of every working day was spent by all the 130 commoners either in the schoolroom or in the courtyard or dining-hall of the building (wholly destitute of modern comforts, and happily now among the things of the past), in which the commoners were housed. Each boy (except the six senior prefects, who shared a 'study' with as many desks between them, and some of the youngest who sat at the tables) had a cupboard containing his books, etc., set up against the wall of the dining-hall, with a desk for ink, etc., and a seat in front upon a fixed form, which was carried all round the hall. During certain hours every boy had to sit there in his proper place, preparing (or supposed to prepare) his lessons; order being kept by a master, when present, or by a prefect in the absence of any master. All the 130 had their meals in this hall, at tables set longitudinally for that purpose; and, during and after breakfast (I think also during and after tea and supper) the juniors in a certain course and order were, or were supposed to be, in readiness, when called to do such services as the prefects might require of them.

"Most of the prefects when Ward became senior prefect were new to that office; and neither Ward nor any other had held it long. The six seniors who shared the study between them (and on whom the main weight of the trouble which followed fell) were Ward, Tindal (son of the Solicitor-General, afterwards Chief-Justice of the Common Pleas), and Gaselee (son of a judge and afterwards a double first-class man at Oxford), Lowe (now Lord Sherbrooke), Abraham (also distinguished at Oxford), and myself. We were, taken altogether, below the average age and strength usual at the top of the school; we were of little account in school games. . . . .

In this state of things the conditions seem to have been wanting for combining popularity with the attempt to enforce school discipline. Prefects possessed of the qualities which make up the schoolboy's hero—physical activity, brilliancy at the games, bodily strength,—might have secured the order of the school, without losing the goodwill of the younger boys. But Ward and his friends had necessarily to sacrifice one thing or the other; and while some of the prefects were more disposed to let things take their own course, Ward, in spite of the *odium* he incurred, insisted on the strictest enforcement of discipline. His dogged conscientiousness, in the teeth of public feeling among the boys, at last brought things to a crisis.

"An effort," continues Lord Selborne, "which Ward made one

morning to enforce his authority resulted in a sudden, and (no doubt) preconcerted resistance. A great number of boys, of all sorts and sizes, rushed simultaneously to the rescue of an offender whom he was about to punish, jumping on Ward's back, taking possession of his arms and legs, and almost choking him. I was one of the prefects present, but we were powerless and helpless. I followed him to the door, making his way out with herculean strength, dragging with him a load sufficient (as it seemed to us) for an elephant (to which animal the boys sometimes compared him) to carry."

Six boys were expelled in consequence of this insurrection, and the matter attained publicity from a controversy which ensued between Dr. Williams (who had succeeded Dr. Gable as headmaster) and Sir Alexander Malet, brother of one of the offenders. Ward received little credit from the public for his conscientiousness. The papers espoused the cause of one of the boys who had been seriously hurt by him as he struggled to defend himself, and Ward himself was spoken of in terms amusing to look back upon: "What will be the future fate of this unhappy young man it is difficult to prophesy. So much cruelty of disposition at so early an age is indeed a sad augury for his future career."

His summer holidays were generally spent either at Northwood with his grandfather, or at Cobham with his uncle, Mr. Harvey Combe. It was here that his family for the first time came to believe in his great conversational talents. Mr. Harvey Combe had looked upon him as a peculiar and odd boy, with no taste for sport, unable to enjoy what others enjoyed, and had paid little attention to him. An eminent and cultivated dignitary of the Anglican Church, however, who was staying at Cobham one summer, at once detected the originality and unusual gifts of William George Ward, and conversed with him constantly, to Mr. Combe's surprise, and ended by giving his opinion that the boy had very great powers both of talking and of thinking, and would some day make his mark. Thenceforward he was looked upon in a more serious and respectful light by his relations at Cobham.

The intense melancholy of his disposition was noticeable in boyhood, in spite of his keen powers of enjoyment and sense of fun. It was owing partly to his constant headaches, and to the ill-health which, without destroying the energy of

his nature or the strength of his constitution, prevented his ever enjoying a day of real comfort: and this reacted on his mind, and gave to his view of life a touch of morbidness. The "background of his life," as he expressed it, was melancholy, and he had a consequent craving for amusement, as the only relief from positive pain. "Who will tell me of something to look forward to," he often exclaimed to his schoolfellows. And he used to say that, even in the early years of his childhood, he was wont to confide to his sister Emily that he thought life altogether so melancholy that he wished to be out of it. One additional trial to him, which diminished later in life, was the sense of being misunderstood both at home and at school. He had to go through something of the pain which George Eliot describes as attending him who has the poet's nature without the poet's voice. Great delicacy and sensitiveness of feeling and perception were hidden beneath a clumsy exterior and a brusque and bluff manner, and the rough-and-ready view of him formed on external grounds by schoolboys and relations whose tastes and ideas were uncongenial, was a constant source of trial.

He left Winchester soon after his seventeenth birthday in 1829, and through some accidental delay in placing his name on the books did not go up to Oxford until the October term of 1830. In the interval he devoted himself to miscellaneous reading, chiefly in mathematics and political economy and philosophy, the works of Mill and Bentham being especial favourites with him in these latter departments.

## CHAPTER II

### LIFE AT OXFORD

In the October term of 1830 Ward went up to Oxford as a Commoner of Christ Church. The religious movement in which he later on took so prominent a part had not begun; and he was thrown in contact with the political discussions of the Oxford Union, which was then at its zenith. His own Winchester friends, Roundell Palmer, Lowe, and Cardwell, looked forward to a political career, and so, greatly by force of circumstances, Mr. Ward's early Oxford life was identified with the stirring debates to which the period of the first Reform Bill was calculated to give rise.

"We lived in the same set at the University," writes Lord Selborne, "consisting chiefly of Balliol and Trinity men, with a few from Christ Church and some other colleges. It included Tait, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury; Scott, now Dean of Rochester; Cardwell; Lowe; Rickards, lately counsel to the Speaker, and now K.C.B.; William Sinclair, brother of Sir George and Miss Catherine Sinclair; and Charles Marriott, who in due time became a learned and universally esteemed divine. Besides their agreement in other intellectual pursuits the members of this set had a common centre of interest in the 'Union' (the University debating society), in which many of them, and Ward among others, took leading parts, when the generation of which Gladstone and Sidney Herbert were the great lights had exchanged that mimic parliament for the floor of the House of Commons."

Ward is spoken of in an Oxford pamphlet[1] of the time as "Tory chief" of the Union, and he was elected president of

[1] In the English version of the *Uniomachia*, described later in the text, comes the line, "Ward Tory chief, and Cardwell's graceful mien."

the Society in the Michaelmas term of 1832, having filled the office of treasurer in the preceding term.[1]

The change from Winchester to Oxford was in every way congenial to Mr. Ward. The awkward eccentric boy, who had no taste for the games, and whose talents found little scope in the routine of school life, and were little appreciated, passed now into an atmosphere where intellectual gifts were the great passport to success, and speculation and discussion in one form or another were the chief interest. His conversational powers developed, while his speaking at the Union is said to have been extremely forcible and fluent. It appears from the records of the Union that the first occasion on which he spoke was on 23d February 1832. Lord Lincoln, president for that term, was in the chair. The motion before the Union was, "That the weak and vacillating conduct of the Ministry has mainly tended to produce the present distressed state of Ireland." This was moved by Mr. Berry of Brasenose. Ward proposed as an amendment, "That whatever may be the main causes which have produced the present alarming condition of Ireland, the weak and vacillating conduct of Lord Grey's Government has in no small degree aggravated the existing evils." Another amendment was moved by Mr. Cardwell, "That the evils which for the last thirty years have afflicted Ireland, have not been ameliorated by the measures of late pursued towards it." Mr. Cardwell's motion was lost, on a division, by 42 to 18. Ward's amendment was then adopted by Mr. Berry, and carried without a division. His name is not again found in the debates until 17th May of the same year. Mr. Rickards was in the chair, and Ward moved, "That an absolute monarchy is a more desirable form of government than the constitution proposed by the Reform Bill of Lord John Russell." He was supported by Roundell Palmer among others, and opposed by Mr. Lowe. The motion was lost by the small minority of six. From that day onwards his name appears in almost all the debates.

The political life of the Oxford Union was at its very

[1] The presidents of the Union during the years 1832 and 1833 were the Earl of Lincoln, Mr. Rickards, Mr. Roundell Palmer, Mr. Ward, Mr. Cardwell, and Mr. Tait.

best at that time, and, in the opinion of many, attained a higher level than even in the previous generation of Gladstone and Sidney Herbert. Politics as such were, however, less attractive to Ward's speculative mind than political philosophy —the adjustment of the laws of government, its principles, its ends. He was a hereditary Tory, his father and his great-uncle Mr. Plumer Ward (both of them at that time members of the Lower House), being staunch Tories. But while adhering through life to many articles of the Tory creed, it cannot be said that his principles were conservative after he began to think for himself. His sympathies were always strongly with the people, and against all unchristian abuses of caste; and though he consistently disapproved of the Reform Bill of '32, and upheld the importance of many aristocratic elements in society with which the Radical would do away, he did not hold these views on conservative principles. Hallam has thus described the contrast, historically speaking, between the principles of the two great parties: "The Whig had a natural tendency to political improvement; the Tory an aversion to it. The one loved to descant on liberty and the rights of mankind; the other on the mischief of sedition and the rights of kings." And again, it has been said that the Tory treats the constitution *as such* as the great end; while the Liberal looks at the constitution as having a claim to his respect only so far and so long as it is found to be beneficial to the people. If these definitions be correct, from a very early period so much of the Tory programme as Ward upheld was advocated on the Liberal theory. "He always brought everything back to first principles," writes his old friend Mr. David Lewis, of Arundel;[1] and in its very definition thoroughgoing Toryism refrained from this. It naturally followed that his conclusions themselves grew somewhat broader as time went on, and he came to advocate measures identified with Liberal politics. Thus we find him on 16th May 1833 bringing a motion before the Union in favour of admitting Jews to seats in the Legislature. The conception was too advanced for the politics of Oxford, and his motion was rejected by 42 votes to 18.

As to his manner of speaking in the debates it is described as extremely simple in language, rather rapid, fluent, clear in

[1] Mr. Lewis was Ward's contemporary at Oxford.

argument with the clearness of Euclid, giving the impression that the speaker was intensely in earnest, and supported by a very fine and melodious bass voice, with great power of subtle cadence. The present Dean of St. Paul's, looking back at those days, gives the palm in speaking to Ward and Robert Lowe. Cardwell was equally fluent, but the effect of his speeches was injured by a touch of affectation. He attempted to imitate the mannerisms of Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons, and the result was a certain self-consciousness, a straining after effect. With both Ward and Lowe, according to the Dean's account, there was a strong sense of the seriousness of the matters in debate; and they raised the atmosphere of discussion above that of a mimic parliament,—playing at ministers as boys may play at soldiers,—to that of serious men discussing views known and felt in all the importance of their bearing. If the palm must be given to either, Lowe carried it off in the directly political debates, and Ward in those connected with the carrying on of the Union, and in such times of dissension among its members as that referred to by Archdeacon Browne in the letter which I print in this chapter.

A sketch of the "Union" speakers appeared at the time in one of the magazines, describing a conversation between a father and son who have been present at one of the debates, and discuss the relative merits of the various speakers. The son is captivated by the brilliant and flowery oratory of Cardwell; but the father says, "To my thinking much the best speaker is that stout young man with the bass voice, who speaks with his arm resting on the table. Everything he says is weighty, clear, and impressive; and he speaks as though he were thoroughly convinced that he is right." This young man was Ward.[1]

The following letter from Archdeacon Browne of Bath and Wells to myself gives some recollections by a contemporary of the scenes amid which Ward's undergraduate life was passed:

"I promised," he writes, "to send you a few recollections of your late father, Dr. W. G. Ward, in his earlier Oxford days. He was somewhat junior to me, but as I was made tutor of my college immediately on taking my B.A. degree, I resided for some years after my undergraduate days were ended, and therefore numbered

[1] This description was repeated from memory to me by one who read it. I have not been able to find the original paper.

amongst my intimate friends some of the leading and most distinguished undergraduates. I need not remind you that amongst such Ward held a high place as well in the estimation of the University authorities as of his contemporaries. He was at first a commoner of Christ Church, but for some reason, it might have been some trifling disagreement with his tutors there, he stood for a scholarship at Lincoln College, and was unanimously elected.[1] He was even then a powerful reasoner, and could well maintain his ground in argument whether in public debate or in friendly conversation. He was a great walker, and often I was his companion in his constitutionals, when we discussed subjects of Oxford interest both ancient and modern. When Arthur Stanley came up he frequently formed one of our walking party. Ward always held very strong opinions, and often said to me, 'Browne, you and I shall never agree, for you will always be a moderate man, which I can never be.'

"Great as were his talents and unwearied as was his taste for reading, both literary and scientific, he had no poetic talent. I remember he used to give us amusing examples of his verse exercises at Winchester; *e.g.* in a copy which he had to write on Daniel in the lion's den, he used to quote with great humour as a specially fine passage—

> 'Cras rex solque simul surgunt, rex advenit antrum,
> Et voce exclamat magna "nunc si potes exi."
> Respondit Daniel "rex vive in secula cuncta."'

"He would draw our attention with great zest to the alliteration in the first line. . . .

"His great passion was for music, in every kind of which he took the greatest delight, from the operas of Mozart and Rossini to the burlesques at the Olympic. One of the principal fields in which he won his reputation as an undergraduate was the Union debating society. In most of the debates he took a leading part, and, so far as my memory goes, spoke on the Tory side in that memorable debate on Parliamentary reform in 1832, in which Mr. Gladstone led the opposition to the Reform Bill and converted Alston, the son of the member for Hertford, who immediately on the conclusion of Gladstone's speech walked across from the Whig to the Tory side of the House amidst loud acclamations.

"The year 1833 was celebrated in undergraduate annals for the establishment of the club called the 'Rambler,' so named because it held its meetings at the rooms of each of the members in turn. Of this club, as I had already taken my B.A. degree, I was senior member. Its history was as follows: The committee of the Union, amongst whom were Roundell Palmer, Edward Cardwell, A. C. Tait, W. G. Ward, J. Wickens (late Vice-Chancellor), were opposed by

[1] The reason for his leaving Christ Church is given on p. 25.

Lowe, Massie, and Brancker, two Ireland scholars, and others; and owing partly to their feeling too secure in their places the standing committee was beaten in the election. Political feeling may have had something to do with setting up this opposition, as the old committee were nearly all Tories. The result of this was that the old committee, with the aid of some of their supporters in the Union, founded the Rambler. The names of almost all the members of the Rambler have since become well known. Amongst them, besides the few I have already mentioned, were its first president, Edwardes Lyall, who died Advocate-General of India; and its first secretary Allies, Examining Chaplain to Blomfield, Bishop of London, who, alas! was one of those regretted friends who, with Cardinal Newman, Capes, Fathers Tickell and Faber, Bowden, and your dear father, left our Church;[1] the Right Honourable Sir J. Mowbray, Bart. (then known as John Robert Cornish); Sir G. K. Rickards, K.C.B.; Scott, afterwards Master of Balliol, now Dean of Rochester;[2] Archdeacon Giles; Dean Stanley; R. Montgomery, the poet; Barne, the well-known vicar of Farringdon; the gentle C. Marriott, Principal of Chichester Theological College; Thomas Jackson, Prebendary of St. Paul's; W. Sinclair of St. George's, Leeds, and a few others whose names I cannot call to mind.

"The interest which all of us took in our new association, together with the freedom which we enjoyed in our small home-like meetings, rather interfered with the attendance at the Union, in fact to such an extent that the new committee actually entertained the idea of expelling the Ramblers from the Union, and proposed a motion with that object, which was, as might be expected, unsuccessful. It happened that one of the members, T. Jackson of St. Mary's Hall, was at that time engaged in correcting for the press a new edition of Homer for the Clarendon, and was therefore full of the Homeric spirit. With some assistance from W. Sinclair, a member of the same hall, who took a great interest in the debates both of the Union and of the Rambler, he published a Homeric poem in macaronic Greek Homeric verse, describing the battle between the two societies, entitled *Uniomachia*. It had a dog-Latin interpretatio, and a spicilegium of annotations added by the present Dean of Rochester (Scott). . . . In this poem the different leaders are characteristically described—*e.g.* Ward is Τωρείστος Ὄαρδος, Sinclair is Σίγκλαιρος Σκιμμήριος, Skimmery being the well-known substitute for S. Mary; R. Lowe is μελάγγουνος, he having just put on his B.A. gown; R. W. Mayow appears in the form of Athena as a peacemaker with the epithet μείλδὸς, A. C.

[1] "By the by, it was said jestingly by one of the enemies of our society, that not much could be expected of a club of which the president was Lie-all and the secretary All-lies."

[2] This sketch was written three years ago.

Tait leaps on the ground, brandishes his cap, stirs up the row afresh, and is fined a sovereign for disobeying the call to order of the president; Marriott is called φιλαιτατος ὠρειήλων, and as he had a melancholy voice, and was often called "groans," comes forward μέγα γρώνων. The result of this undergraduate strife was that the quarrel was made up; all became good friends, and a grand reconciliation dinner took place in the Star Hotel, at which most of the members of both societies attended, and I, as the only member who had taken holy orders, said grace.

"Such were the friends amongst whom your dear father lived and moved, beloved and respected, in his Oxford undergraduate days; friends who, from the late Archbishop of Canterbury downwards, never forgot his open cheerful countenance, his powerful intellect, his gay humour, and his affectionate disposition, although different walks of life separated them from him—days which were crowned with one of the highest prizes Oxford can bestow, a Fellowship of Balliol."

The Union absorbed all Mr. Ward's energies during the greater part of his undergraduate days. Both the public matters debated, and the domestic controversies referred to by Archdeacon Browne, afforded ample food for the discussions in which he revelled. His whole heart was in it. "There goes old Ward, the walking incarnation of the Union," Cardwell is reported to have said one day on seeing him saunter in to a late breakfast party. He had little taste for the regular studies of the University, and was entirely devoid of any ambition to distinguish himself. He was a constant but very desultory reader, reading very rapidly and retaining accurately what he read, though unable to continue the effort for long together without intermission, owing to the headaches which were a perpetual source of trial to him. His reading, moreover, was miscellaneous, and he was in no sense a student. He had no idea of taking honours until his father's embarrassed circumstances made it a matter of importance that he should stand well in the class list, and obtain a fellowship. For this purpose it was necessary to put off his examination and read with a tutor. The regulations at Christ Church not permitting this, he stood, as we have seen, for a scholarship at Lincoln, and was unanimously elected in 1833. But even the importance to his future of securing his double first was not sufficient stimulus to make him work steadily at subjects not to his taste—"out of his line," as he expressed it—and when

given by his tutor, on the eve of examination, a set of specially important formulæ in mechanics to learn, he sat up reading one of Miss Austen's novels instead. The rapidity and accuracy of his work in pure mathematics were said to be wonderful; but he could not bear applied mathematics, the experimental methods whereby natural forces are understood, and the necessity for being content often with approximate results, being especially distasteful to him. "The study of friction makes me feel literally sick," he used to say; and nothing would induce him to work seriously at what was so uncongenial. In classical scholarship, again, he was, in Latin especially, quite firstrate. But in the matter of collateral knowledge, as to the history of the works he was reading, the circumstances of their composition, the lives of their authors; and again, as to the history of the times with which they dealt—except so far as it was conveyed in the actual works themselves—he professed total ignorance. He said that such things did not interest him and that he did not understand them, so he simply left them alone.

Most men under actual examination do their best to conceal their ignorance, or at least to try and find a partial answer even if they have not sufficient knowledge to give a complete one. But with Ward it was otherwise. Directly he was questioned on subjects he had not got up, without waiting to reflect whether his knowledge might enable him to give some answer, he abruptly and aggressively insisted that he knew nothing whatever about them. He had a curious pleasure, too, in being more than candid in admissions to his own disadvantage. The result was a memorable and amusing scene when his *vivâ voce* examination for his degree came on in 1834. His examiners in classics were Mr. Augustus Short; Mr. W. H. Cox, the great supporter of Dr. Hampden in his celebrated conflict with the University in 1836; Mr. Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury; and Mr. E. W. Head of Merton, afterwards Sir Edmund Head. His examiners in mathematics were Mr. Arthur Neate of Trinity, Mr. W. R. Browell, and Mr. G. Johnson, afterwards Dean of Wells. The *vivâ voce* examination in classics was public, and when a prominent man was being examined the schools were thronged by undergraduates and fellows. Con-

siderable curiosity was felt as to how Ward would acquit himself, and the audience was large.

One of Cicero's letters to his brother Quintus is chosen, and the examiner tells Ward to turn to a particular part. Ward reads it admirably, his voice being excellent, his intonation and inflections faultless, and his sense of the meaning and spirit of the passage leaving nothing to be desired. Attention is aroused. The audience—consisting of a large number of undergraduates and a good sprinkling of dons—is on the *qui vive*. Here is a firstrate man evidently. The construing comes next, which, if not quite so exceptionally good as the reading, still quite bears out the expectation of a display of first-class ability. The examiner, in obvious good humour, says at the end, "Very well, Mr. Ward, and now let me ask you, What are the principal letters which we have now extant of Cicero? To whom were they written?" Ward (without the slightest hesitation), "I really don't know." The examiner (surprised, and after a short pause), "The letter from which you have just construed a passage was written on the eve of a very eventful time; can you tell me something of the events which followed immediately afterwards?" Ward, "I know nothing whatever about them." This was said with perfect gravity and in a tone of philosophic resignation. "Take your time, Mr. Ward," says the examiner, "you are nervous." "No, sir," replies Ward, "it's not nervousness; pure ignorance." The examiner made another attempt. "In what year was it written?" Ward (with energy), "I haven't the slightest idea." (Father Faber used to say that as the examination proceeded he began to give his answers in a tone of resentment, as though the questions were impertinent ones.)[1]

His frank confessions of ignorance attracted the attention of the well-known Dr. Jenkyns of Balliol, and drew from him an often-quoted malaprop, "There is a candid *ingenuity* about the fellow which pleases me," he remarked to a friend. Ward's scholarship, however, went for a good deal; and though in the face of his disregard of the required historical and collateral work a first class was out of the question, the examiners gave him a second.

[1] This description is taken down from the account of an eye-witness. My informant does not, however, vouch for the exact book chosen for the examination.

In the mathematical schools the case was similar. There were five papers for the written examination on pure mathematics, and five on mixed. The five on pure he did without one mistake, and in the very best style. With the five on mixed he dealt as follows:—He sent up four of them absolutely blank, attempting no single question. On the fifth he saw a question about a rainbow of which he knew something, and he drew a sketch of the rainbow and sent up the paper without any further attempt. "It was the very shadiest rainbow I ever saw," his friend Johnson, one of the examiners, afterwards told him. Still the excellence of the papers on pure mathematics was such that Mr. Johnson wanted to give him a first class, notwithstanding his unceremonious treatment of the rest. In the end they gave him a second in the mathematical, as they had in the classical schools.

Before he stood for an open Fellowship at Balliol there was some thought of his election to a close Fellowship at All Souls. The chief passports to success at All Souls were social, both as regarded connection and personal qualities. His father's influence and wide circle of friends secured him ample support on the first head; and the master and fellows wished to know more of the personal qualities of the candidate. They are said to have been fairly puzzled when he was asked to dinner and put on his trial. The interest and power of his conversation quite carried them away; but then the total disregard of conventionality, and of the principle that a fellow of All Souls should be *bene vestitus*,[1] were not to be endured. These shortcomings were, however, forgotten at dinner while he kept the whole table absorbed (as a contemporary expresses it) in the unceasing succession of views, anecdotes, and discussions which he poured forth; and it was said that had the votes been taken then and there he would have been unanimously elected. But Mr. Sneyd, the dignified warden of All Souls, was a great stickler for the proprieties of life; and when the pros and cons were afterwards weighed, he could not brook the coolness with which the honour of his invitation to dinner had been treated. "He had not even taken the trouble to change his boots," he said.

He was elected to an open Fellowship at Balliol on the

[1] The three qualifications for an All Souls' Fellowship were (according to Oxford traditional gossip) *bene natus, bene vestitus, mediocriter doctus.*

same day as the late Archbishop Tait, during the interval which elapsed between his examinations for his degree in classics and mathematics.

The events connected with the ten years of his Fellowship, including the period when he was one of the most prominent and active of the advanced Tractarians, shall be related shortly. Here it must suffice to say that up to the year 1838 he was a disciple of Arnold and Whately, the precursors of the Broad Church school; and that from 1838 to 1845, under the influence of Mr. Newman's teaching, he advocated the views of the Oxford movement in a pronounced form which left little doubt that he was on his way to the Roman Church. But, before tracing this part of his career in detail, some selections must be made from the reminiscences kindly furnished me by those who knew him as Fellow and Mathematical Lecturer at Balliol, that a clearer idea may be formed of his characteristics and habits.

He is described as stout and unwieldy, but of striking presence; with clear cut features of great mobility of expression, and as having a "joyousness of manner" which was infectious. When serious, says a friend, his face expressed a remarkable combination of intellectual power with gentleness. His voice was powerful and musical in speaking as well as in singing, and "his laugh mighty." His speech was always downright, straightforward, and frank to a fault. His statement was clear and direct, and there was no escape from him in argument. He always went straight to his point, without conventional preamble. He would meet a friend out walking, and accost him in the same breath with "How d'ye do?—what do you think of Newman's answer to Fausset on such a point?" The first occasion on which A. P. Stanley (afterwards Dean of Westminster) ever saw him—at a time when he was fresh from Rugby and when Ward was beginning to read with eagerness Dr. Arnold's discourses—is thus described in a letter from Stanley to W. C. Lake:[1] "Last night a large moon-faced man—Ward, of Lincoln, late of Christ Church—rushed into Faber's rooms, and on seeing me, at once asked when the new volume of Arnold's sermons would be out." He could not bear pretence of any kind in others, and still less could he endure that others should credit him

[1] The present Dean of Durham.

with good qualities which he did not believe himself to possess. He loved a startling opinion and in its most startling form, and he delighted in perplexing everyone by the abrupt statement, or rather over-statement, of an undeniable truth in the most unacceptable words conceivable. "My impression of him generally at that time," writes the late Dean Scott of Rochester, "was that partly from an honesty of mind which could not endure that his friends should not know of him what they would think the worst, and partly from a playful fondness for displaying his dialectics in conversation, a great discount was to be allowed on all that was most startling in what he used to blurt out. He had a mischievous delight in making the 'moderates' stare." The brusqueness of manner of which his schoolfellows speak seems to have become less pronounced at Oxford, as his taste and opportunities for intellectual conversation grew; though it still found occasional expression in abrupt and somewhat Johnsonian rejoinders. For example, there was a story current of his sitting at dinner next to a clergyman who had been preaching at St. Mary's as select preacher. Ward had been present at the sermon, and had condemned it to his friends as one of the worst he had ever heard. The preacher, in all unconsciousness, began at once referring to his sermon, and asked Ward if he had heard it. As the conversation proceeded, the difficulty of speaking of it at length without implying his view of its quality increased. Ward had been all the afternoon boiling over with indignation at such a sermon being tolerated in Oxford; and now malicious fortune had placed him in a situation in which he had to keep on saying civil things to the offender. Struggling still to keep on safe ground he asked, "How much do they pay you for these sermons?" "Five pounds" was the reply; and after a pause, "Don't you think that enough?" The answer which suggested itself was irresistible: "I don't know," Ward replied; "I wouldn't have preached it for fifty."

His love of paradox betrayed itself in his conversation constantly, not only on lighter topics, but in discussing the most serious problems. Even when the conclusion he wished to express was most real and important, he would often throw it into a startling form. Thus in discussing the question of equivocation, as to how far it is lawful on occasion, he main-

tained, as against those who admit the lawfulness of words literally true but misleading, that the more straightforward principle is that occasionally when duties conflict, another duty may be more imperative than the duty of truthfulness. But he expressed it thus: "Make yourself clear that you are justified in deception, and then lie like a trooper." So, too, in reference to his pet aversion, the typical Churchman of those days—the dignitary of moderate views and immoderate income, with his want of enthusiasm, his serene self-satisfaction, his selfishness, his love of place and power—he would say: "If any man be called 'moderate' or 'venerable' beware of him; if he be called both you may be sure he is a scoundrel."

But, though he loved to express himself in a startling manner, he was intensely in earnest in all his views. There was no flippancy or unreality of thought. The paradox arose rather from perceiving a truth so keenly, or adopting an opinion with such energy and force, as to exaggerate its true character. And this often had the effect of impressing his meaning more clearly on the mind than more hesitating and qualified statements, as the cartoons in Vanity Fair may give the character of face and person more forcibly than a photograph.

All his contemporaries—friends and comparative strangers alike—are agreed as to his extraordinary powers of conversation, and his invariable kindliness in spite of the occasional "knock down" repartees which would come from time to time. They were accompanied by a *bonhomie*, and an almost sympathetic expression of face, which took the sting out of them. Indeed he seemed sometimes to take a pleasure in combining the utmost gentleness and geniality of manner, the sweetest and most affectionate smile, with some tremendous denunciation of the "detestable" or "base" character of the view he was opposing. "He never lost his temper," writes Mr. David Lewis, "and there could not be a more genial and good-tempered disputant than he was. However much he was tried by the obstinacy or ignorance of his opponents he never was uncourteous or hard. His great command of himself in this respect explains the fact that he had personal friends with whom perhaps he held no principle in common." Dean Scott of Rochester, who was his contemporary at Balliol, looking back at those days, while allowing that they were not sympathetic

souls—for he could never follow Ward in his extreme opinions—writes: "I admired—no one could help admiring—the manliness and kindliness of his character, his zeal for truth and boldness in searching for it, and the wonderful brilliance of his conversation, especially when it took the shape, as it often did, of argumentative discussion." And Lord Coleridge, speaking of the same days, says: "Like every one who knew him, I delighted in his society, and thought him one of the cleverest and most brilliant men I ever came across." Another friend adds: "He was never prosy and never absorbed the conversation. His own animation in talking was infectious, and made others talk. He was ever ready to lead the conversation to topics on which others had something to tell him, and was anxious to learn from them. This habit, as well as his own rare powers of talking, made him invariably the centre of any social group in which he found himself." The Rev. James Lonsdale, a son of the late Bishop of Lichfield, and Mr. Ward's pupil in mathematics, writes thus of him:—

"I was his college pupil in mathematics; in teaching them he was vigorous and animated. He was most undonnish, but yet we felt that we could not take liberties with him. . . . He was not very particular as to his dress, and would say, 'What is the use of my dressing well? I am never anywhere except in London and at Oxford. In Oxford it does not matter because every one knows who I am. In London it does not matter because no one knows who I am.' . . . He was at Oxford long before the history schools were established, and was no believer in history as a study,[1] and I remember his saying, 'I would as soon know all about Mr. Smith getting up in the morning, having his breakfast, and going to the city in a 'bus, as the details of Cambyses conquering Egypt.' . . . He had a wonderful memory, and could repeat scores of lines of burlesque poetry. In conversation he was marvellously quick, and lively, and varied; of anecdotes he had a great store; he was always willing to listen to objections to what he had said, and surprisingly quick in giving answers to them. He was unwearied in arguing; to hear him argue was indeed a treat. As I look back through many years, I can remember none like him, and have a lively recollection of his kindness to those who were younger and

[1] This statement must be somewhat qualified if it is to be reconciled with some of his Oxford writings. But he certainly disliked the dry details of history, where they threw no light whatever on the philosophy of life.

inferior, his willingness to talk to them, and to listen to them too, the clearness of his intellect, the good-humoured enjoyment with which he entered into discussion, his apparent desire of fairly sifting all questions to the bottom. I remember his saying to me, 'My creed is very short: Credo in Newmannum'[1] (this was of course after he had joined the Newmanites in 1838).

"Many an argument in particular would he have with Mr. Tait, then fellow of Balliol, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. The shrewdness of the Scotchman and the logical power of Mr. Ward were well pitted against one another. Once when Mr. Tait said, 'Your opinions are not the right ones for a fellow of this college to hold' (referring . . . to Tractarian opinions), he answered in an instant:—'I should like to know whose opinions, yours or mine, agree most with those of the founders of the college.' He asked his friend Mr. Oakeley, then a fellow of the college, 'Melancthon was not so *detestable* as the rest of the reformers, was he?' . . . There was a clever but perhaps rather conceited candidate for a fellowship at Balliol, and one of the fellows said, 'If he should be elected I fear we should never be able to keep him in order in the common room,' but another answered, 'I think we need not fear, Ward will do that.'

"Having to leave the college on account of my health, I lost the pleasure of your father's wonderful conversation and kindly society just at the time when I should have enjoyed them most. However, the remembrance of them and of your father is very distinct after the lapse of between forty and fifty years. His great friend in college was kind, good, loveable, and scholarlike, gentle Mr. Frederick Oakeley; and the striking contrast between the two friends, both so good, yet so very different in manner and gifts, makes me remember both most clearly and most pleasantly, so that at times I can almost fancy I am still in the old common room with them."

Besides the discussions in the Balliol common room, another opportunity for conversation was his daily constitutional, which was always taken in company with one or two friends. This was a chief occasion for dialectics, carried on often in Socratic form. "When I walk with Mr. Ward," said G. R. Moncreiff (a son of Lord Moncreiff, the Scotch judge), "he begins by stating a certain number of principles which are so plain as to seem like truisms; I agree to them one after

[1] "He told, too, I recollect, of a man who used to thank God that he could worship Him in the retirement of his closet and the privacy of his pew; and of another who used to repeat the Apostles' Creed with an alteration, 'I believe in the Holy Protestant Church.'"

another, when suddenly he opens a trap-door and I find myself landed in Rome."

Mr. Moncreiff tells me that rapidity and clearness of intellect were equally conspicuous in his official capacity as mathematical lecturer. "For quickness and readiness of resource," he writes, "for neat handling of analytical processes, and for appreciative interest in his pupils' endeavours to follow his lead, I have hardly ever known his equal. Let me add the special merit that nothing in his hands remained dull; his characteristic humour found vent even over dry formulæ or complex analysis, so that one came away from mathematical lecture with the feeling—not very usual in such a case—of having spent an hour in genial intercourse with one who found real pleasure in training us to clear and vigorous thought. Out of lecture hours he was still more delightful. . . . There was no more amusing companion to be found in Oxford. I saw most of him in long walks, in which I may venture to say there was hardly a silent moment. He talked almost incessantly on all topics of the day—theology, politics, and matters of University interest. His views on all points were fresh and original, or at least if not strictly original, he had made them his own by fearless and independent thought."

Mr. Thomas Mozley, in his *Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement*, recounts his own impressions of intercourse with Mr. Ward:—

"From the time," he writes, "when Ward rolled in to a breakfast party at Christie's a few days after his coming up to Oxford till my occasionally coming across him in town, I never had much to call conversation with him, nor could it ever have been of the slightest use. He was a vast deal too sharp for me. I had a good answer ready for him in time—that is half an hour too late. Coming out of the old chapel in Margaret Street, I think about 1844, I found myself between him, Oakeley, and one or two others. We were soon in the thick of the great question. How we arrived at the particular point I know not, but I adduced it as an argument against the system before us, as that in Roman Catholic countries, bandits went out on their expeditions fortified with prayers to the Madonna, and with her pictures or her medals suspended from their necks. Ward promptly replied, 'Catch two murderers or two thieves and search them. One has nothing about him but his weapons, the other has a Madonna tied to his neck. Which is there the most hope of? There is no ground of hope for one;

there is some ground of hope, something to work upon, in the other.'

"Of course I might have replied that one knew nothing about the first, but that as to the second, one knew that he had formulised religion into a thing not merely worthless but even wicked, an aid to robbery and murder. You were positively cut off from hope there. Ward will no doubt have a reply ready to this should it ever meet his eyes."

Another point which his contemporaries speak of in his conversation was his way of viewing himself as a third person, —of judging of his own character, gifts, and peculiarities, as though he were an onlooker at his own life. He was perfectly conscious of his intellectual gifts, and considered that to ignore them would be as unreal and affected as to ignore the colour of his hair; but he did not care to dwell on them, and his greatest enemies never accused him of vanity. He looked at his mind just as he would look at some one else's. Purely intellectual gifts seemed to him so inferior to high ethical qualities, that he could scarcely understand intellectual vanity, and he was always lamenting over and exaggerating the degree in which he fell short of his own standard in self-discipline and piety. He delighted, as Carlyle did, in superlatives and strong expressions, and a character or a thing was with him either "noble" or "detestable," a tendency "indefinitely important for good" or "deplorable," a view "transcendently able, and throwing a flood of wholly unexpected light" on the subject, or "morally base and intellectually contemptible." "Intellect," he said to Henry Wilberforce, "is a wretched gift, my dear Henry. Absolutely worthless. Now my intellect is in some respects almost infinite, and yet I don't value it a bit." On the other hand, he would speak in unmeasured terms of his moral defects. "If I know anything at all of myself," he once wrote, "I should say that whether or not I be considered to rate too highly my intellectual powers (an imputation on which I am not in the least sensitive), at all events as to my moral qualities, I am in some considerable measure impressed with a knowledge of my deplorable deficiency." Long vocal prayers or discourses tried him, and he was equally candid in his confessions on this branch of his religious shortcomings. "A sermon bores me to death," he would say, "but I always was a most disedifying man." He used to tell of

the preternatural sagacity and foresight of a certain baby as to the tortures in store for it, because having during the christening ceremony remained perfectly quiet, when the clergyman got to the words addressed to the godfather and godmother, "And that he may know these things the better ye shall call upon him to hear sermons," it forthwith set up a howl so loud that the ceremony could not continue for some time.

Another instance of his way of viewing himself as though he was an onlooker at his own life was the enjoyment he had in stories against himself. He would detail, with his usual exaggeration, the impression which some of his peculiarities produced at first sight on those who had never met him or conversed with him. His eldest sister, who lived at Oxford, was very handsome and universally liked, and he would describe how he overheard one who had met them for the first time say, "That charming, graceful Miss Ward; I was delighted with her. How does she come to have such a huge awkward-looking brother?" or again how Jenkyns on reading his book, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, said, "Well, Ward, your book is like yourself, fat, awkward, and ungainly."

It has been said that he either took to a particular study with passiónate eagerness and mastered it completely, or declared that it bored him to death, and that he would have nothing to do with it. Mr. Wynell Mayow describes the great amusement Ward created among the committee of the Union, when, after some splendid speeches delivered by him on Lord John Russell's Reform Bill, it was suggested that he should lead the debate on some question of political economy with which he was not familiar, at the blunt emphasis with which he refused. "I know nothing whatever of the subject. Quite out of my line. I'm far too stupid in such matters to be of the slightest use." And while in a similar spirit he absolutely refused to go through all the work necessary for a first-class degree in classics and mathematics, he devoured with the utmost avidity the works of Bentham, John Mill, Carlyle, Macaulay's Essays as they appeared, every novel good and bad which was published, but above all the works of Miss Austen, which he read again and again, and great portions of which he knew by heart. When a new book or article of interest appeared he "threw himself upon it," as one of his

contemporaries expresses it. An article by Mill in the *London Review*, or *Tait's Magazine*, or such a work as *Froude's Remains*, was devoured by him with the utmost rapidity. Every point was marked, and a note taken of it at the end of the book, and he had the whole subject ready at once for detailed discussion with his friends. I have books of his literally covered with references and pencil marks. His great personal clumsiness and incapacity for "dealing with matter" must not pass unnoticed in a description of his personal peculiarities. "His want of manual dexterity," says a friend, "was in curious contrast to his intellectual adroitness." There was a story of his sending his scout to buy him a pencil, and, on receiving it, complaining that it was a bad pencil and made no mark. The scout looked at the pencil and then at his master, and remarked, "You have not cut it, sir." To the end of his life he could never make up a parcel, and had the greatest difficulty in fastening up a letter. He looked on the process as very mysterious, and on the result of his endeavours as uncertain, and generally asked a friend or his servant to do it for him.

In proceeding to speak of Ward's passion for music and the drama, which was still greater at Oxford than in his school-days, it must be noted that the thoroughness with which he entered into such recreations was due in a great measure to a trial of which I have already spoken—and which his extreme enjoyment of the pleasures of social intercourse made people slow to suspect—the insupportable attacks of melancholy to which he was subject. His constant ill-health for hours, and sometimes for days, unfitted him for work, and left his abnormally active and speculative mind preying upon itself. And as at such times his intensity of temperament led to almost morbid depression, the same intensity would make him seize enthusiastically upon any means of escape from himself. He fled from the perplexities and religious doubts which harassed him at such times, and threw himself into any form of congenial recreation with the utmost unreserve. With a keen sense of the possibilities of happiness in life, and an equally keen sense of the contrast between his own life and such imagined possibilities, he loved to plunge for some hours into an ideal world, and did so with zest and thoroughness.

Music and the drama were his great means of transporting

himself into this ideal world, and he availed himself of them constantly. The intensity of the relief corresponded to the intense feelings of distress and ennui to which he was subject. The play, the opera, the philharmonic concerts, the burlesques at the Olympic, Macready's Shakespearian performances, were all in request; and he enjoyed them like a boy. He would give also to his friends, with dramatic action and throwing himself entirely into the situations, sketches of the various performances of this kind which had attracted him. But in doing so he was extremely sensitive to the character of his audience. Always shy and reserved on first acquaintance with a stranger, it was only in the midst of intimate friends and persons in complete touch and sympathy with his dramatic exhibitions, that he was able to give them. But when he was thoroughly at home in this respect, he unbent with a thoroughness and a dramatic *élan* in curious contrast to the abruptness and English downrightness of his manner on other occasions.

The following letter to a very intimate friend gives some indication of the ill-health and depression to which I have referred, and which cannot be passed over, as these trials were in reality the key to much in his life and character. It will read strangely to those who scarcely ever saw him without a smile on his face, or talked with him for ten minutes without hearing a hearty laugh.

LETTER TO A FRIEND. 1844.

. . . "My health has not been at all good these two days. In fact I very much fear that I shall not be at all right in that respect until I shall have had a good long rest. My first day at Oxford indeed is always a great trial . . . but I ought to have been able to-day to do more than I have been able. . . . You rather wished to hear about a day in Oxford, so I will describe to you yesterday; though you must remember that it must not be taken as an average day. In the morning after breakfast I went to the reading-room (as I told you I should) and read the papers; there I met Forbes (the friend of mine who told me that my character was so Italian), and after a little talk with him I returned to my rooms and tried to read a little of the new part of St. Athanasius which has just come out. After a very little time I was obliged to give up the attempt and the idea of doing anything serious before dinner; accordingly I resorted to a very common expedient of mine and ordered dinner at three o'clock, hoping to have more power in the

evening. I then got hold of a pamphlet which Stanley has been writing (in MS. not yet to be published), and having to go for it to Temple,[1] one of our fellows (a very excellent and pleasant person), I took the opportunity of engaging myself to walk with him from two to three. I read through Stanley's pamphlet which interested me a good deal, and then went up and called on the Observer.[2] He was in and was, as always, particularly cordial. After leaving him I went in to Parker the bookseller's to wile away the time till two, and then went out with Temple. At three I dined in my rooms, and after dinner went to sleep; on waking I felt so much better that I flattered myself I should make a good night's work of it, but was soon undeceived. I read Suarez for about a quarter of an hour and recited Vespers; then took a walk in some university walks, reciting Compline, then at six I went to evening chapel; but after that, and having had tea, I found myself, alas! quite unfitted for further exertion. J. Morris came in just after tea and stayed for half an hour or so; then I went down to find Macmullen,[3] who was not in, and concluded with Stanley . . . and so the day closed. I believe the fact to be that my brain works almost incessantly at those times when I cannot work steadily at all; and that the amount of thought which passes through my mind in the day is part of the reason why I can read so little. It is a great misfortune that I have so little taste for beauty of form, etc., as that would be a wonderful resource for me. . . . I won't go through to-day's employments in a similar way, but may as well mention that during part of to-day I was exposed to one of my very worst fits of listlessness and incapacity for exertion. At such times prayer seems just as impossible as methodical reading. . . . It is a long time since I have been so much tried in that way as to-day. . . . I shook it off at last (when it got a little better) by forcing myself, most distressingly against the grain, to recite some of to-day's office (it is singularly beautiful; you will see it in the 'Supplementum Novum,' it is a commemoration of our Lord's prayer in the garden) and then went out to fulfil an engagement I made yesterday of walking for an hour with the Observer. The remains, however, of the attack is even to this minute upon me, and will not in fact go off except by a good night's rest, which I hope in all probability to have."

The musical seances with his friends, which formed one of his chief modes of escape from this depression and weariness, were varied in character. Sometimes Coffin, afterwards Bishop of Southwark, used to play, and Ward, who had a mag-

[1] Now Bishop of London.

[2] Mr. Manuel Johnson—known as "Observer" Johnson.

[3] R. G. Macmullen—one of the Tractarian converts, now Canon Macmullen.

nificent voice, would go right through some of the best *arias* in Mozart's and Rossini's operas, in true dramatic style, before a select audience. "Non piu andrai," from the *Nozze di Figaro*, and the rapid buffo song, "Largo al factotum," from the *Barbiere*, were among those most frequently chosen. An equally favourite form of amusement was to sketch a *ballet d'action* on some event of university interest; Mr. Macmullen's dispute with the Regius professor, Dr. Fausset's attack on Dr. Pusey, or Ward's own relations with the Master of Balliol, were represented in this way. Dr. Jenkyns of Balliol was an especially favourite character in these performances, and Mr. Ward would send his company into fits of laughter by a combined imitation of the peculiarities of the master's manner, and the received movements of the *ballerina*—the pirouette and the various forms of step, fast and slow, and the pantomimic expression of wrath, pleasure, or amazement, as each was called for, according to the recognised rules of the *ballet d'action*. Ward would represent each character in turn, while Coffin or Oakeley played the pianoforte. The contrast between these performances and his more normal occupation of deep discussion on religious metaphysics, was startling. "It is just as though Thomas Aquinas were to dance a ballet," one of his friends said. On one of these occasions the performance was more vigorous than usual, and Ward was for the moment impersonating Cupid. Mr. Chapman, one of the tutors, was unable to continue his reading in the room below, and sent his scout to ascertain the cause of the disturbance. The scout came back with the assurance, "It's honly Mr. Ward, sir. 'E's a hacting of a cherubym."

After he had joined the Newmanites he considerably curtailed the amount of dramatic and musical recreation he allowed himself. He never entered a theatre at all for eleven years, and in Lent by Dr. Pusey's advice, as the ordinary corporal austerities injured his health, he made it a rule to forego all music whatever. One Lent when three weeks had passed in this way he met Coffin in the High Street and said, "I have such an awful fit of depression that I feel as if I should go out of my mind; don't you think that a little music for once may be allowed?" After some discussion it was agreed that a little strictly sacred music might pass. Begin-

ning with Cherubini's "O Salutaris" they gradually passed to "Possenti Numi" in the "Flauto Magico." But this opened a book containing songs somewhat lighter, and the duet between Papageno and Papagena followed. The music waxed faster and livelier till it culminated in "Largo al factotum," the lightest and raciest of buffo songs, in the middle of which one of the company suddenly recollected that the room in Christ Church in which he was singing was separated only by a thin wall from Dr. Pusey's own rooms.

The present Bishop of London, Dr. Temple, gives some characteristic recollections of his first conversation with Mr. Ward, when his taste for music and the drama revealed itself under circumstances in which this was least to be looked for. Mr. Temple had just come up to Oxford as a young undergraduate, and being considerably ahead of his contemporaries in mathematical studies, arranged to be coached privately by Ward. The tutor gave him various exercises to work out to test his knowledge, and these were brought to Mr. Ward at the appointed hour for revision and correction. Mr. Ward received him with all kindness, and at once looked through the exercises, correcting them, the Bishop says, with "extraordinary rapidity," showing here and there easier methods, noting interesting mathematical points in the various possible solutions. For a quarter of an hour or so the mathematical work went on at highest pressure and without intermission, and fresh exercises were set for next time. Then Mr. Ward got up and stood with his back to the fire, and somewhat to his pupil's surprise asked abruptly, "Have you been to London lately?" and then proceeded, "you should go to the Olympic and see 'Olympic Devils,' by Planché, it is quite as good as or better than 'Olympic Revels.' I saw the piece last week." And forthwith the grave mathematical tutor commenced giving an accurate and dramatic sketch of the plot of the burlesque. The *symposia* of the gods in Olympus were graphically described, and Planché's amusing rhymes repeated with great *gusto* and perfect accuracy. For example, the chorus of gods at dinner to the tune of "The roast beef of old England:"

> "If mortals who cannot exist upon air
> Could see us at dinner, ye gods, how they'd stare;
> See us hydrogen quaff and on oxygen fare,

Singing, 'Oh, the roast beef of Olympus,
And oh, the Olympic roast beef.'"

Or again, Orpheus' monologue in Tartarus in which he remarks:

"'Tis said that marriages are made above,
And so perhaps a few may be by love;
But from this smell of brimstone I should say,
They must be making matches here all day."

The whole play was gone through, the songs and dances indicated, the merits of Madame Vestris as Orpheus discussed, and the peculiarities of Mr. Bland as Pluto, of the three Miss Irelands as the three Fates. The whole caste was remembered down to the most unimportant "super." Temple, having got over his first surprise, was much interested; and thenceforth the hour set apart for his private coaching was about equally divided between algebra or the differential Calculus, and conversation, sometimes on the drama or opera, but later on, as Ward attached himself to the fortunes of the Tractarian party, more often on theology and the prospects of the Church of England.

The intensity of Ward's interest alike in these grave subjects and in the drama, or again in the dramatic aspect of human life, and the effect on those who met him of so unusual a combination, has been sketched with graphic power in a letter to myself, which the writer—the present Dean of St. Paul's—has kindly allowed me to publish. The Dean writes as follows:—

"I wish I could do justice to that singular and almost unique combination in your father of the utmost *abandon* and readiness for amusement, with deep seriousness and reality of feeling and purpose, and with the dignity which such reality gave. He was what appeared to many as Quixotic as any Puritan in his inflexible and inexorable demands for instant submission to the logical results of a principle, or an acknowledged rule or discovery of conscience. A Puritan with this tone and temper of mind becomes stiff, intractable, severe, unable to endure to see other people steering a different course from himself, impatient, censorious, δύσκολος. There were good men connected with the party of which your father was one of the chiefs, of whom something of this kind might have been said. But though he was quite capable of severity of

judgment and of indignation, his view of the largeness and variety of things, and characters, and ways, was so quick and comprehensive, that he saw, what other severe thinkers did not see, the manifold play of human life, with all that is pathetic and all that is odd about it, and he was as much interested and captivated by this as he was with his intellectual problems. The zest of one was as great as the zest of the other; both equally great in their season. And so it came to pass that there were many hours when he was as unembarrassed as a schoolboy let loose in his enjoyment of the company of his friends, and in doing his best to keep up the ball of conversation, and to amuse them with his own powers of presenting the comic side of things, in caricature, in anecdote, in taking off dramatic scenes and singing parts from Mozart's or Rossini's operas. Where I used to see all this most was at the observatory at Mr. Manuel Johnson's dinner table. A small number of friends used to meet there continually, very often on Sundays. Mr. Johnson was a man in whom high scientific enthusiasm was combined with the warmest affection and boundless sense of humour. His laugh was a thing to inspire and brighten up the most doleful of pessimists. And there your father was very welcome and was continually a guest. Everything was discussed—London politics, foreign revolutions, Oxford theology, and the wickedness of Hebdomadal boards; and along with these high subjects Mr. Johnson's last purchase of a curious book or a rare engraving, theories and ideals of art, the sentiment of the Düsseldorf school, all with a running comment of chaff and illustration—the judgments of those who understood or thought they understood, the flings and gibes of those who didn't, interrupted by explosions from the mighty laughers,[1] and varied by interludes in which your father would give with real musical effect a dialogue from *cosi fan tutte*, or act a despairing lover on his knees to an extemporised Donna Elvira represented by some grave college tutor, driven into fits by the grotesqueness of the situation. Of course this was only among friends. In general company he was only gay and serene, very cordial and accessible, and always provoked by the presence of some supposed hostile member of the company to be personally most courteous and sympathetic, but also on occasion to startle him with what sounded like an astounding paradox."

One more anecdote may be related illustrative of Mr. Ward's *abandon* on certain occasions of university social life. The present Bishop of London, then Fellow of Balliol, who told me the story, had organised a party at Balliol, in the summer of 1844, including besides many Fellows from various

[1] It used to be said that when Johnson and Ward laughed together in the observatory the sound could be heard at St. Giles'.

colleges, a contingent of their lady friends who were staying in Oxford. Mr. Temple had for a time some difficulty in persuading Mr. Ward to join. There was to be music, and possibly dancing; and he thought that the master would not approve of what was, to some extent, a novel experiment. However, after talking the matter over, he came to the conclusion that he might, without scruple, join the party. He was, says Bishop Temple, even for him in wonderful force and spirits. He was the life of the conversation, full of anecdote, of repartee, of amusing comment on everybody and everything. The troubles of theological disputes and the persecutions of the Hebdomadal board were all forgotten. If it was lawful to join the party, it was certainly lawful to enjoy it thoroughly. Every one was talking with admiration of his singing, his conversation, his unflagging powers of enjoyment and of amusing his friends. The evening, which had begun with the careful and severe examination of the lawfulness of the recreation, with the adjustment of principles of conscience, and the weighing of different claims of duty, ended, as he walked home with Temple, with hearty and enthusiastic expressions of satisfaction. "My dear Temple, what a delightful evening —one of the pleasantest I ever spent; and what charming ladies—I could have proposed to any one of them on the spot!"

## CHAPTER III

### THREE MOVEMENTS OF ENGLISH THOUGHT

It will be impossible to understand the early phases of Mr. Ward's intellectual life at Oxford, without bearing in mind some of the salient features of the condition of English thought in the early part of this century. It was essentially a time of intellectual activity and moral earnestness. Both in "feeling and speculation" the first half of the nineteenth century bore the impress, in the words of Dean Stanley, "of the deeper seriousness breathed into the minds of men, not only in England but in Europe, by the great convulsion of the French Revolution."[1] When, after Waterloo, the immediate strain of international war was removed, the mind of the age, thoroughly awakened and aroused, sought in various directions objects whereon to vent its energy. The consequence was a series of movements political, religious, philosophical, the results of which are visible to this day. "In Germany," continues Dean Stanley, "there was the manifestation of such men as Görres on the Roman side and of Schleiermacher on the Protestant side. In France the same tendency appeared in Madame de Stael and Chateaubriand, as well as in the historical and philosophical researches of the school of Guizot and of Cousin. In England it revealed itself in the enterprise of the abolitionists and in Wilberforce's 'Practical Christianity.' In Scotland it was manifested by three writers, if of unequal fame yet all in their several ways representing the enlarged relations of the human mind to literature and religion,—Walter Scott first and foremost, and following upon him the most

[1] See *Edinburgh Review* for April 1881, Article I., "The Oxford School."

eloquent preacher of that time, Edward Irving, and the sombre genius of Thomas Carlyle."

In matters purely political, too, the time of the Catholic Emancipation, of the French Revolution of July 1830, and of the first Reform Bill, was a sufficiently stirring one; while, in the English theological world, the Evangelical movement inaugurated by Charles Simeon at Cambridge, the Latitudinarian school represented by Arnold and Whately, and above all the Catholic revival within the Church of England,—with its far-reaching effects both on the Anglican Church and on the Catholic Church in England,—are instances of unusual and significant activity.

Three of these numerous streams of life came, at one time or another, into immediate contact with Mr. Ward, and it may be well to say a few words as to their origin, and their connection with each other. I speak of the movement—partly political, partly philosophical, partly theological (or anti-theological)—of Bentham and the two Mills; of the teaching, ethical and theological, of Arnold and Whately, the precursors of the Broad Church school; and of the directly theological school of Newman and Pusey.

The radical school of the two Mills was, in reality, the steady onflow of the movement which had come to a premature and only partially successful crisis in the great French Revolution. The aims of the Revolution were avowedly the aims of its members, though they advocated greater moderation in their methods. John Mill, who in spite of his youth was the most prominent of the party, has told us of the feeling of joy with which he first realised what had been achieved for a time in France, at the close of the last century. "From this time," he writes, "the subject took an immense hold of my feelings. It allied itself with all my juvenile aspirations to the character of a democratic champion. What had happened so lately seemed as if it might easily happen again: and the most transcendent glory I was capable of conceiving was that of figuring, successful or unsuccessful, as a Girondist in an English Convention." When Walter Scott published his Life of Napoleon, Mill came forward as the champion of the Revolution against his attacks; and Carlyle's great work owed much to the same writer's copious notes on the subject. When the Revolution of July

1830 came, Mill tells us that it "aroused his utmost enthusiasm, and gave him, as it were, a new existence." He paid a visit to Paris, which recalls the visit paid forty years earlier by the author of the *Rights of Man*, and was introduced to Lafayette. From that time onward he kept up a certain measure of intercourse with the chiefs of the popular party in France.[1]

Such being the avowed sympathies of the radical school, their influence on English politics and English thought will be readily understood. The indignant revolt of the French Revolution against the claims of custom and prescription was developed by them into a political and philosophical system. By reaction against the tyranny and injustice which the old order had sanctioned in its exaggeration of such claims, they endeavoured to sweep away bodily the inherent sacredness of constituted authority, and to make light of the sanctions of inherited experience, and to reconstitute the world of politics and of thought from new first principles. In politics they advocated the most entirely representative government with the ultimate goal of manhood suffrage (or, according to the most advanced, universal suffrage), and absolute liberty of discussion. In philosophy, the principle of the "greatest happiness of the greatest number" was their watchword, while they waged unrelenting warfare against the authority of instinct, sentiment, and intuition — with little distinction between the various ways in which these phrases are used. In Ethics general happiness, in Psychology personal experience, were the tests to be applied for genuine virtue and genuine knowledge; and these tenets were the more definite and clear from the fact that the later conception of the authority of instinct, as representing the past experiences of the race, had not arisen to confuse the line of demarcation between the "Experience" and Intuitive schools.

The *Westminster Review* (succeeded afterwards by the *London Review*) was the organ of the clique I am now speaking of; and their special views influenced many of the rising generation — notably at Cambridge, where the brilliant conversational powers of Charles Austin powerfully assisted in their dissemination. The *Review* made its first appearance in 1824. Mr. Bentham was its proprietor, and Grote the

[1] See Mill's *Autobiography*, pp. 172 *seq.*

historian, the two Mills, and the two Austins, Charles and John, were among the contributors. Reform of the constitution, Benthamism in philosophy, Reform of the Law, and Reform of the Church, were perseveringly advocated.

These writers were, perhaps, the most active and zealous propagandists of their day in public matters, until the success of the Reform Bill in 1832 aroused forces on the opposite side, real and powerful, though hitherto slumbering. My concern with these forces here is mainly on the side connected with religious and ecclesiastical affairs. Immediately on the passing of the Reform Bill a general attack seemed imminent on the sacredness of tradition in every shape. The men who despised tradition in philosophy as unauthorised sentiment, who waged war against the old-fashioned deification of the English constitution and the English law, now meditated a blow at the historical ordinances and institutions of the English Church. The Church, like the State, was to be dealt with on utilitarian and radical principles. Her position, too, was to be defined, in all consistency of logic, as the servant of the State. The indefinite views afloat as to the nature of the Anglican Church, as, on the one hand, a political body of Christians, whose government and discipline were in the hands of the State, or, on the other, the direct successor, independent in essentials, of the Church of the Apostles, from whom her pastors held their commission and inherited their prerogatives, were to be cleared up in favour of the former and to the exclusion of the latter. It was reported that Parliamentary committees were to revise the Prayer Book and remodel the Creeds. A measure was in progress for suppression by Act of Parliament of ten Irish Bishoprics. The moving spirits of the triumphant faction were opposed to the very existence of the Church. "Next to an aristocracy," writes John Mill, "an Established Church or corporation of priests, as being by position the great depravers of religion, and interested in opposing the progress of the human mind, was the object of [my father's] greatest detestation." The younger Mill himself in 1832 addressed himself to the direct consideration of the rights of the State over church property; and there were serious fears afloat that Church Reform might end in the actual abolition of the establishment.

In this state of things, while the authorities of the English Church remained powerless and inert, there arose from the eager and earnest thinkers of all schools a vehement protest on one hand or the other. The war was *pro aris et focis*, and sides had to be taken for or against the revolution. "The whole fabric of English, and, indeed, of European society," writes Mr. Mozley, "was trembling to its foundations. Every party, every interest, political or religious, in this country, was pushing its claims to universal acceptance, with the single exception of the Church of England, which was folding its robes to die with what dignity it could. . . . At such a time, when a thousand projectors were screaming from a thousand platforms, when all England was dinned with philanthropy and revolution, spirituality and reform, when the scissors and paste-pot were everywhere at work on the Prayer Book, when Whately was preparing to walk quietly over ten Churches in Ireland, and Arnold was confidently hoping to surpass Bunsen's scheme of universal comprehension in England, Newman was laboriously working his way into the hitherto unvisited region of patristic theology."

Two deeply earnest movements within the English Church came before the world in the midst of this general upheaval, represented by two great names, Arnold and Newman. Dr. Arnold had been appointed headmaster of Rugby in 1828, and rapidly commenced the formation of what may justly be called a distinct school of thought. He inherited from the first Oriel school, of which he was a member—the school of Milman and Whately—some of the characteristics of his teaching—its sincerity and reality, its contempt for formalism, its disregard for dogma as such; but he added both in tone of mind and in the views he advocated much which was distinctively his own.[1] He united with Milman and Whately, indeed, in their strong opposition to sacramentalism and to sacerdotalism, but on the relations between Church and State and on Church reform they differed widely; and the Christian enthusiasm which Arnold breathed into his disciples bore little resemblance to the cold and

[1] The Dean of St. Paul's, in a conversation which he kindly allowed me to have with him on the subject, attributed much of the ethical tone in Arnold, which distinguishes him from the Noetic school of Whately, to the influence of J. Keble, who was his contemporary at Oriel.

common-sense religion of the celebrated Archbishop of Dublin. In 1832, alarmed at the prospect of Disestablishment, Arnold published his pamphlet on Church Reform. This publication cannot be said to have produced any lasting effect by itself. The actual scheme advocated was similar in kind to the proposal of Dr. Martineau in our own time, though less extended in degree. It proposed the sinking of dogmatic differences, and the inclusion of the Dissenters within the pale of the State Church. In short, he looked to a closer and more acknowledged union between religion and the State for a remedy for existing evils. The ideal aim was absolute identity between Church and State, as combining the highest principles with the most absolute power. And to approach nearer to this ideal he proposed extending State control to all the most earnest Christianity in the land, which would in turn react upon and purify the State. The conception was obviously Utopian; but Arnold's influence in breathing life into the decaying Establishment was undoubtedly considerable. The young men who went up to Oxford full of his spirit were the representatives of a living religion which had effects far more significant than Arnold's paper theory. They put fresh life into the Liberal party at Oxford, and gave it real influence. "The [Liberal] party grew all the time I was in Oxford even in numbers," writes Cardinal Newman, "certainly in breadth and definiteness of doctrine and in power. And, what was a far higher consideration, by the accession of Dr. Arnold's pupils it was invested with an elevation of character which claimed the respect even of its opponents."

Intellectually, however, the system of Dr. Arnold was from the first a compromise. The Oriel school, to which he belonged —the Noetics, as they were called—had to a great extent imbibed the radical and destructive principles of the school of Mill. "This knot of Oriel men," says Mr. Mark Pattison, "was distinctly the product of the French Revolution. They called everything in question; they appealed to first principles, and disallowed authority as a judge in intellectual matters."[1] Still though bitten with the new spirit they shrank from the anarchy alike of thought and of society to which these principles must legitimately lead. They held their full development in check

[1] See Mark Pattison's *Memoirs*, p. 79.

rather by common-sense than by any clearly-defined logical theory. Logically speaking, Arnold was open to the stinging charge which James Mill made on the *Edinburgh Review* and on the Whigs generally, of shilly-shallying and inconsistency. In the case of the Whig party there was the tradition of popular principles, and in Arnold's case there were inborn popular sympathies; and while Mill could with truth describe the Whigs as "an aristocratic party . . . coquetting with popular principles for the sake of popular support,"[1] and as nevertheless carrying these principles only so far as was consistent with no "essential sacrifice of aristocratical predominance," the same thing might be said of Arnold, though without the suspicion of interested motives. He valued the aristocratic elements in the English constitution, and instinctively shrank from carrying the popular principles he advocated so far as to overthrow them; and, accordingly, he avowed[2] that he welcomed the Reform Bill mainly as a compromise, as granting to the people what, if withheld, might make them eventually clamour for more. And more could not, he thought, with safety be given.

In theology, too, his instinctive common sense exercised a similar check on his principles. He refused to admit Unitarians into his enlarged Church, and insisted on the vital importance of belief in Christ's Divinity, though it would be difficult to defend this position logically according to his theory of Scripture interpretation.

The logical results of a system are not always evident in those who first adopt it, while yet under the influence of early beliefs which may not be a part of the system itself. Thus it has often been said that the effects of Agnosticism will only be really known experimentally when we have a school of hereditary Agnostics. If this be so it is significant of the real tendencies of Arnold's teaching that it should have passed, by lineal descent, through the *Essays and Reviews*, issuing in the intellectual positions advocated severally by Dean Stanley, Professor Jowett, and Matthew Arnold.

The third wave of thought of which I am to speak, which was visible in the movement known as Tractarian or the Oxford Movement *par excellence*, began in the same general

[1] J. S. Mill's *Autobiography*, pp. 93 *seq.* [2] Arnold's *Life*, vol. i. p. 266.

fear for the safety of the Establishment which provoked Arnold to write his pamphlet on Church Reform; but it embodied very different tendencies from those of Arnold's school, and, indeed, was, in some respects, more directly opposed to the latitudinarian theology of that school, than to the general liberal movement which first brought it into existence. The two schools parted company at the very outset, though the object of each was to protect the interests of the Church of England. The danger in Arnold's view lay in Disestablishment—in a tyranny of State over Church which should culminate in confiscation of her land, and the destruction of what was according to his theory the essence of her organisation—her legal union with the civil power. In such a state of things each Christian sect would be free of State control, independent of other sects, and on a footing of equality, and the one form of religious unity which he valued would be destroyed. The remedy in his eyes was to sink doctrinal differences with a view to strengthening the Establishment in numbers and religious zeal, that it might present the obstacles of inherent vitality and of strength and compactness of organisation, to the schemes for its destruction. He even appealed to the High Church party to make common cause with him for this end. The party of the Movement, on the other hand, from the first declared war against the Erastianism of the State. To them the essence of the English Church was that side of her, not which was dependent on, but which was independent of State control. That Acts of Parliament should suppress or establish bishoprics, or that Parliamentary Committees should reform the Prayer Book, was an intolerable invasion of her rights. She was, before all things, the lineal descendant of the Church of Gregory and Augustine, and through them of the Church of the Apostles. Hence the authority of her bishops; hence the sacredness of her formularies. Her dependence on the State was only partial and accidental—partial, as regarding only her civil rights and position, and accidental, as dating only from the Reformation. In short, while Arnold viewed the Church as essentially a Protestant Establishment, the "Movement" viewed her as essentially still a part of the Church Catholic, and complete dependence on the State, which was to the one party her ideal perfection, was in the eyes of the other, as abolishing the

inherent sacredness and authority of Apostolic institutions, her absolute destruction.

So much as this may be said in contrasting the Movement of 1833 at its outset, and considered in all its heterogeneous elements, with the liberal school in theology. But at a very early date that part of the Oxford school which gave it its life and influence took a line yet more marked in its divergence from Arnold's school, and pregnant with consequences at the time unforeseen. At starting the Movement, though I cannot accept Dean Stanley's description of it as a "*political* reaction against the panic which the Reform Bill created,"[1] was certainly eminently practical. It opposed innovations in the constitution of the Church—the invasion of the apostolical prerogatives of the bishops, the admission of Unitarian principles within her pale. Its birthday was the day of Keble's sermon on the "National Apostasy," preached in protest against the suppression of the Irish sees. In this practical movement men like Mr. Palmer (afterwards Sir William Palmer), the author of the *Treatise on the Church*, Dr. Hook, afterwards Dean of Chichester, and Mr. Perceval, the learned Rector of East Horsley, were as eager participators as Newman, Hurrell Froude, and Keble. But the views of these last were far deeper than Mr. Palmer's, and extended much beyond meeting a practical emergency. The contrast will be evident in a moment to those who read Mr. Palmer's narrative of the Movement and Newman's *Apologia*. In one sense it may be said that Mr. Palmer's party was conservative, while Newman's was, though in a very different direction, as bent on radical reform as were the Liberals themselves. Mr. Palmer resented State interference with those elements of Catholicism to which he had been accustomed, in the existing constitution and formularies of the Anglican Church. The speculative questions "whence" and "whither" did not concern persons of his cast of mind. He drew out a definite scheme of action for the Movement—a programme of objects to be aimed at, and ways and means of mutual co-operation, for he looked upon speculation and individualism with suspicion.

With Newman and Froude the case was different. A living idea had got hold of their minds, and they seem themselves to have

[1] *Edinburgh Review, loc. cit.*

felt that they did not quite know whither it would ultimately lead them. They opposed the definite schemes of action and organised committees of Mr. Palmer, confident of the truth and reality of the views which possessed them, and mistrusting premature definitions as stunting the natural and full development of living ideas in living minds.[1] Early in the day Newman recognised that the work of a hundred and fifty years had to be undone in the English Church, and advocated a return to the Anglicanism of the seventeenth century;[2] and Froude's more rapid and outspoken temperament soon led him to disown the Reformation of the sixteenth. The conception of the real nature of the English Church which led to such judgments as these was the idea which more or less definitely had got hold of a number of minds, and Newman's view in starting the *Tracts for the Times* was that individuals who felt strongly, should speak freely and in some sense irresponsibly—that is to say, without committing the whole party to their views, which were not to be regarded as final and full expressions of a conception not yet fully analysed by the writers themselves.[3] "The *Tracts* were not intended," he wrote, "as symbols *ex cathedrâ*, but as the expression of individual minds; and individuals feeling strongly while, on the one hand, they are incidentally faulty in mode or language, are still peculiarly effective. No great work was done by a system; whereas systems rise out of individual exertions. Luther was an individual. The very faults of an individual excite attention; he loses, but his cause (if good and he powerful-minded) gains."[4] The writers of the *Tracts* pursued their studies, each in his own way, of the early Fathers and of the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century—Hooker, Bull, Laud, Bramhall, Stillingfleet—and each advocated, with a general agreement in principle, though with minor differences among themselves, a restoration of Catholic customs and doctrines which had become

[1] Cf. Palmer's *Narrative*, Edition of 1883, pp. 56, 57.

[2] See *Tracts* 38 and 41, published in the course of the first two years of the Movement.

[3] Besides the passage referred to in the text there are many others in Newman's *Apologia* illustrating this view, *e.g.* at p. 69. Again in p. 71 he writes ". . . hardly any two persons who took part in the Movement agreed in their view of the limit to which our general principles might religiously be carried."

[4] *Apologia*, p. 42 (Edition of 1875).

obsolete since the Revolution of 1688. The exact nature and degree of the restoration contemplated by each might differ, but the writers were agreed in their general spirit.

Early, then, in the Movement the really powerful stream of thought which it contained separated itself, in some degree, from the cut-and-dried scheme of Mr. Palmer and the conservative High Churchmen, and turned itself in a direction whose *terminus* was confessedly somewhat uncertain.[1] The feeling embodied in the beautiful stanzas of "Lead, kindly Light"—"I do not ask to see the distant scene," and "One step enough for me"—seem to have indicated what was from the first Newman's view of the situation. Principles and ideals were plain, but the nature of their practical outcome could not be known, and time alone could disclose it. In 1836 Newman made, in a series of lectures in St. Mary's, the first systematic attempt to define publicly the theory of the Anglican Church which the Movement advocated, which he called the *via media* between Protestantism and Popery. The lectures were entitled "The Prophetical office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism." They professed to explain the logical outcome of the Movement, but they did not succeed. In their very form they were tentative. "It still remains to be tried," he said, "whether the *via media* is capable of being professed, acted on, and maintained on a large sphere of action, or whether it be a mere modification or transition stage of either Romanism or popular Protestantism." He owns in the *Apologia* that he had a latent feeling that his mind had not found ultimate rest. The theory was a provisional one, and the Movement had not really explained itself. It was advancing towards something, but its *terminus* was still out of sight. Of this, however, I must speak later.

Principles and ideals, I have said, were plain, and this brings us to the nature of that further opposition to the liberal theology to which I have already referred. Newman and Froude developed a distinctively philosophical and intellectual element in a movement which had hitherto been primarily

[1] I do not mean by this to imply, what a friend who has seen this passage in proof seems to think it implies, that the *Roman* movement came early. Keble, as well as Newman, represented the "powerful stream" to which I refer; and the uncertainty did not necessarily imply a doubt that the *terminus* was something consistent with the Anglican formularies.

practical; and as the High Church party had consistently opposed the Erastianism of Arnold's practical schemes of Church reform, so the intellectual direction of the Oxford school was opposed to the *principles* of liberalism. The sacredness of tradition and the authority of the religious instincts lay at the root of Newman's philosophy, and this was the re-assertion of principles which Arnold had gone far with the Radicals in destroying. Again, the watchword of Newman was Dogma; the watchword of Arnold was the "anti-dogmatic principle." In Newman's view dogma was of the essence of religion, and certain particular dogmas of the essence of the Anglican Church. The Liberals, though differing among each other in the extent to which they applied their principles, disparaged dogma as unconnected with moral goodness, and maintained toleration of dogmatic differences to be a part of Christian charity. "A visible Church with sacraments and rites, which are the channels of Invisible grace,"[1] an episcopal dynasty descended from the Apostles, an obligatory body of doctrine, to be found in Scripture, but only recognised there by the aid of Church tradition—these are the essential features of Newman's *via media*. The liberal school, on the contrary, denounced the priesthood as an invasion of Christian equality, the fulness of the sacramental ideal as a species of superstition; some, as Hampden, openly maintained the dogma of the Incarnation to be a theological opinion and unessential to the "simple religion of Christ;"[2] others, as Arnold, treated the Catholic doctrine of a visible church as inconsistent with the position of an English Churchman.

Each party had standing and influence at Oxford in 1834, and as they were opposed in principles, so each viewed the other's increasing influence with dismay. When Dr. Hampden sent his pamphlet on *Religious Dissent* to Newman, the

[1] *Apologia*, p. 49.

[2] My citation is from the *Apologia*, p. 57. As Newman has been accused of unfairness in his account I add the following extracts. Dr. Hampden asks the Unitarian "whether it is not *theological dogmatism* and not *religious belief* properly so called which constitutes the principle of his dissent," and states that he "cannot for [his] part deny to [Unitarians] the name of Christians." He further commits himself to the statement that "Theological opinion as necessarily mixed up with speculative knowledge ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian society, or a mark of discrimination between Christian and Christian." *Observations on Religious Dissent*, by Hampden. Second edition, pp. 20, 21, 22.

latter wrote, "I dare not trust myself to put on paper my feelings about the principles contained in it, tending as they do, in my opinion, altogether to make shipwreck of Christian faith:" and Arnold characterised the aims of the Movement, in terms yet more bitter and far more contemptuous, as "a dress, a ritual, a name, a ceremony, a technical phraseology—the superstition of a priesthood without its power, the form of episcopal government without its substance, a system imperfect and paralysed, not independent, not sovereign, afraid to cast off the subjection against which it was perpetually murmuring—objects so pitiful, that if gained ever so completely they would make no man the wiser, or the better; they would lead to no good, intellectual, moral, or spiritual." The opposition between the two parties was from 1836—when the case of Dr. Hampden was brought before the University—onwards even more incessant and active. The Liberals maintained that the Puseyites would ruin the Church of England as a National Church; and that the logical outcome of their tenets was Popery; and in actual Popery, Arnold prophesied in 1836, the Movement must end. The Puseyites declared that Liberalism would ruin the Church of England as an apostolic church, that its logical outcome was free-thought, and that in actual infidelity it must some day issue.

Each party was conscious of its devotion to the English Church, and each strenuously denied the truth of the auguries of the other as to its tendency and destination. So little did the leading Newmanites believe that they were furthering the interests of Popery, that one of their avowed objects was to check its growth in England. They were to put new life into the Catholic doctrines implied by the English liturgy—doctrines which had practically become a dead letter—and were thereby to give the Church new vitality and unity. "Nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully preached," wrote the editor of the *Tracts* in 1834, "will repress that extension of Popery for which the ever-multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way;" and again he writes, "Methodism and Popery are in different ways the refuge of those whom the Church stints of the gifts of grace; they are the foster-mothers of abandoned children. The neglect of the daily service, the Eucharist scantily administered,

insubordination permitted in all ranks of the Church, orders and offices imperfectly developed, the want of societies for particular religious objects, and the like deficiencies, lead the feverish mind, desirous of a vent to its feelings, and a stricter rule of life, to the smaller religious communities, to prayer and bible meetings, and ill-advised institutions and societies, on the one hand; on the other, to the solemn and captivating services by which Popery gains its proselytes." The Movement thus professed to be directly anti-papal, as Arnold's views on Church reform professed to be especially directed against the success of the irreligious Radicals. The Newmanites proposed to inoculate the Church with a little Popery, the Arnoldites to inoculate it with a little liberalism, as the best safeguard against these diseases in their malignant form. Both parties were represented most prominently by men with great personal attachment to the Anglican Church and great regard for God's glory. The steady and resistless march of intellectual principles in both cases to their legitimate issue is the more remarkable. Arnold saw truly when he said in 1836 of the outcome of the "Movement," "It will not take the form Newman wishes, but its far more natural and consistent form of pure Popery;"[1] and Newman's account of the tendency of liberalism "to make shipwreck of Christian faith" may claim to have been prophetic. At least the one side can point to the conversions of 1845, while the other may appeal to the association of the name of Arnold in our own day with a belief concerning the Supreme Being differing little in its essence from Mr. Herbert Spencer's Agnosticism.

However, our concern here is with the two parties as they then were, with their mixture of opposite intellectual principles with agreement in high elevation of moral tone, and devotion to the Church of England, as each side conceived it. The formal declaration of war between them in the University of Oxford may perhaps be fixed at 1836. Dr. Hampden, who has been already referred to as the author of a latitudinarian pamphlet, had likewise expressed his views in the Bampton lectures delivered by him in 1832. On his being appointed Regius Professor of Divinity in 1836 a movement was set on foot, in view of the laxity of his views, to deprive him, by the

[1] See *Arnold's Life*, vol. ii. p. 60.

vote of Convocation, of two of the usual privileges associated with his appointment—the right to a vote in the nomination of select preachers, and his position as one of the judges in the cases of heresy which came before the University. Newman and Pusey were active promoters of this measure, which was ultimately successful. It was warded off at first by the *veto* of two proctors,—sympathisers with Hampden,—but on the accession of two new proctors, Convocation was summoned again and the final measures passed.

One special tenet of Hampden, which provoked the censure of the High Church party, must not be passed over. It was his advocacy of a relaxation of the University tests—one of which was subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles—in order to admit wider divergence of theological opinion among Oxford graduates. This he had advocated in the pamphlet already referred to, and the Bampton lectures were considered to breathe a similar spirit of latitudinarianism and indifference to dogmatic Christianity. Thus began a struggle on the part of the Puseyites to maintain inviolate the Church of England *formulæ*, the effects of which a few years later unexpectedly recoiled on their own heads; and thus began explicitly the controversy in which Mr. Ward took so active and eager a share during the remaining nine years of his Oxford career.

## CHAPTER IV

### EARLY INTELLECTUAL AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY

I HAVE now to give some account of the earlier phases of Mr. Ward's intellectual history. So far as directly religious opinions go, his own writings while at Oxford—his unpublished sermons from 1837 onward, and the Articles in the *British Critic* in which he gave constant vent to his thoughts—afford sufficient materials for this; and their progress and history shall be traced immediately. But one word must be said at starting as to the earliest influences on his mental culture. Mr. Gladstone said of him in 1844 that he owed more of his mental culture to the writings of John Mill than to all the Anglican divines put together, Mr. Newman excepted;[1] and this statement, taken from the internal evidence of his writings, was true as a fact. In his early Oxford days, indeed, his acquaintance with Newman's writings had not begun, and it is not too much to say that the strongest directly intellectual influence exercised on him was that of Mill and Bentham. "His reading and his opinions," writes Dean Lake of Durham, "were (in 1834), and continued to be for some years, a rather curious mixture. In philosophy he was, or believed himself to be, a thorough Benthamite, and devoted especially to young Mill, whose articles in the *London Review* of those days we all eagerly devoured"; while in theology, "without ever having been an Arnoldian, he was a warm admirer of Arnold as well as Whately."

The influence of Mill and Bentham, however, dated back still earlier, as we have already seen; and he was familiar with

[1] *Quarterly Review*, October 1844; Article—"Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*."

their writings in his undergraduate days. That he at any time adopted their Utilitarianism in its entirety, as some of his friends suppose, seems improbable; but alike in method and in *ethos* they were singularly attractive to him, and left evident traces on his mind. "Ward was a born logician," Mr. T. Mozley has said; and the method of these writers appealed strongly to such an intellect. They fostered in him a love of completeness in statement, of clear and explicit discussion, a suspicion of mere tradition or custom, a dislike of the slightest confusion of expression, or want of system in philosophy—all these on the intellectual side; and, in addition, an appetite for drastic reform, and the moral qualities of candour and love of truth. These points are evident from first to last in Ward's language concerning both writers, though he rejected their views far more completely after than before he had joined the Tractarians. Mistiness was to him the greatest of intellectual trials, and dialectics the keenest of pleasures. And those who canonised mistiness as all one with religious mystery, and looked askance at argumentative discussion as savouring of rationalism, were at all times his natural enemies. Mill and Bentham represented the completest imaginable *antithesis* to such a spirit.

He expresses this feeling in writing in the *British Critic* on Mill's *Logic*. "It appears to us," he writes, "that there is a tendency in a certain class of writers in the present day (a tendency which probably had its origin in the reaction against the philosophy of the last century) to look with great suspicion on clear, consistent, straightforward thought and language; a tendency to admire the self-contradictory as being all one with the mysterious, and to regard the pursuit of system as betokening in itself somewhat of a rationalistic and dangerous disposition. Yet surely, as has been said, 'system is the very soul of philosophy,' and is in no other sense rationalistic than philosophy itself is so." And he proceeds to hail with satisfaction in Mill and Bentham alike, their clearness and explicitness of system and expression. The boldness with which Bentham challenged the moral sense school as giving "no reason for the sentiment [of right], and setting up sentiment as its own reason;" the scientific form into which he threw the application of the happiness principle, analysing the various

classes and orders of consequences, and the classification of offences, which so much impressed John Mill in Dumont's *redaction*, were equally attractive to Ward as an intellectual treat. And Mill's own adoption and exposition of Utilitarian principles seemed still more thorough and able. Mill's "earnestness and single-mindedness" are, moreover, strongly insisted on in the article from which I have quoted. It speaks of his "purity and manifest devotion to truth," and his "susceptibility to every breath of reason." "At a time," it continues, "when so much of *charlatanerie* is written, and finds acceptance on the most serious subjects of thought, to meet with an enquirer who bears every mark of a single-minded and earnest pursuit of truth, cheers and relieves the spirits."

Such were the intellectual armour and weapons with which Mr. Ward entered on his career at Oxford—an equipment similar to that of John Mill himself, allowing for a difference of antecedents. On the other hand, Mill's historical studies, which, if not congenial to the bent of his mind, formed an important part of his early training, had no counterpart in the Oxford thinker; and Ward's early religious education and deep religious instincts were important points of divergence from Mill at starting, and in the event led to an absolute contrariety between the two in principles as well as in opinions.

Love of system and consistency were not qualities which made the Anglican Church an object of intellectual satisfaction. The outgrowth of a complex theological past, representing historically widely different schools of thought, attractive mainly from her connection with what was dear to English hearts, from a beautiful liturgy much of which was in logical opposition to the Thirty-nine Articles of Subscription, from early historic memories of which she was the embodiment, in point of religious vitality and earnestness at so low an ebb that her dissolution was looked upon as imminent, she had little in her to attract one who, like Ward, had, theoretically at least,[1] no love of England and no taste for history, and who looked mainly for two things—clearness and consistency of system, and ethical earnestness. The Anglican Church, indeed, as a

[1] His peculiar love of English characteristics—fair-play, straightforwardness, downrightness, etc.—makes one slow to say that his theories against patriotism corresponded to his own feelings in every respect.

Church never aroused in him one spark of patriotism, and the only interpretation of it he could endure was that of Archbishop Whately. Whately brought to bear on theology Mill's method of free discussion, and his readiness to question unsupported tradition and sentiment.

The progress of Ward's religious views during the next few years—from 1834 onwards—consisted in the gradual development of two tendencies—to free discussion and abstract speculation intellectually, and to the practical realisation and application of his high moral and religious ideal ethically. They were, he afterwards came to hold, really divergent; and the intellectual principle—of universal questioning and explicit analysis and discussion, as the one road to truth,—led to a scepticism which left no basis for his ethical principles. Harmony between the intellect and conscience was effected for him for the first time by Newman's teaching. Looking back at this period later in life he wrote: "I was enmeshed in the toils of a false philosophy which could have had no other legitimate issue except a further and further descent towards the gulf of utter infidelity. From this thraldom the one human agency which effected my deliverance was Father Newman's teaching. My deliverance was wrought not merely through the truth and depth (as I consider) of those philosophical principles which he inculcated, but also through the singular large-mindedness whereby he was able to make those principles both intelligible and attractive to every variety of character." The mental process whereby this came about must now be traced from his writings, at the risk of some prolixity of detail, and of the introduction of a certain amount of technical discussion.

The point of departure was general dissatisfaction with the Anglican Church in her existing condition. She did not represent—as did the Protestant Churches abroad—the triumph of Lutheranism or Calvinism; she was not—as the Orthodox Churches in St. Petersburg or Constantinople—merely in a state of external schism from Rome; she was not a part of the Roman Catholic Church. She was not merely Protestant, merely Catholic, or merely schismatic. She was a compound of the three. In doctrine partly Protestant, partly Catholic; in position schismatic. The High Church represented the

Catholic, the Low Church the Protestant elements; and in so far as Protestantism is a direct negation of Catholic doctrine, and of the conception of the Catholic Church, the two parties were logically in conflict. The effect on the average concrete Churchman of these very opposite influences—tainting High Churchmen with a little Lutheranism and Low Churchmen with a little Catholicism—was a curious and perplexing intellectual study. Cardinal Newman has described it in a passage which Ward delighted to quote.

"In the present day," he wrote, "mistiness is the mother of wisdom. A man who . . . never enunciates a truth without guarding himself against being supposed to exclude its contradictory—who holds that Scripture is the only authority, yet that the Church is to be deferred to; that faith only justifies, yet that it does not justify without works; that grace does not depend on the sacraments, yet is not given without them; that Bishops are a divine ordinance, yet that those who have them not are in the same religious condition as those who have—this is your safe man, and the hope of the Church; this is what the Church is said to want, not party men, but sensible, temperate, sober, well-judging persons, to guide it through the channel of no-meaning between the Scylla and Charybdis of Aye and No."

And closely bound up with this general haziness as to what was believed was an equally unsatisfactory account, on the part of High Church and Low Church alike, as to why so much and no more was believed by each party. Church authority in so anomalous a state of things was a quicksand which few ventured to tread firmly; and yet, if Scripture were the only guide, both parties seemed to take a prejudiced view. There were texts telling both ways, and each side quoted one set giving no fair weight to the other. There was no coherent basis of belief—true or false—to be found at all. "How the principles of 'Conservative Anglicanism' can be placed on any philosophical basis at all," Ward wrote, "or how they can be so much as stated plainly and consistently without disclosing features which would repel the most cowardly and most indolent, I have never been able to learn."

Whately set Mr. Ward free from this maze of inconsistency. He did so, it is true, by a ruthless criticism of Scripture proofs.

He did not reconcile and arrange Church doctrine and its proofs; he destroyed them. It was the method of a dentist who extracts all his patient's teeth as the best means of curing toothache. But still he was consistent, and arranged systematically the *residuum* which he retained. If his treatment of Church doctrine recalled Tacitus' words, "Solitudinem faciunt pacem appellant," such doctrinal barrenness was at least less distressing than the constant war of contradictory propositions. If dogma was so unsatisfactorily proven by each of the extreme parties, he argued, the correct solution seemed to be to minimise the amount of essential doctrine, to sympathise with the good and religious men of all parties, to place dogmatic theology in a secondary place, and the vital rules of conduct and the main practical beliefs of Christianity, in which all schools were agreed, in the foremost rank. Mr. Ward speaks in the *British Critic* of the "special charm" in Whately's writings arising from "his apparent anxiety to do justice to all the different parties of the religious world, to recognise and praise what was good in each, and deprecate uncharitable misconstructions on all sides;" and, on the other hand, allied to this large-minded sympathy with all that was good in every school—a protest against intolerance—there was in Whately a protest also against the unreality of basing difficult and mysterious doctrines simply on ambiguous passages of Scripture, which were utterly insufficient for the weight they had to sustain. The directly sacramental character of orders, the real presence in the Eucharist, the inheritance of guilt, making us displeasing to God, from the act of our forefathers in which we had no share,[1] —these were difficult points on which Mr. Ward was glad to take the liberal view, whether from the unsatisfactory nature of the proofs adduced, or (as in the last-mentioned case) from their insufficiency to counterbalance the difficulties inherent in the doctrines themselves. There seemed to him an element of "sham" in the profession of beliefs of this kind on such slight foundation. And when, further, mere prejudices were made the foundation for utter intolerance of all other views, and were erected by their supporters into absolute certainties,

[1] *British Critic*, vol. xxxi. p. 268, etc., he refers to these features in Whately's teaching. In the same essay are to be found numerous indications of the qualities in Whately's writings which had in the past attracted Mr. Ward.

the paradox of the position appeared still greater. "In dubiis libertas" seemed an obvious maxim in such cases. Intolerance in believers in an infallible church always seemed to him far more consistent; but, to take an example, for High Churchmen to make the uncertain interpretation of such a text as "This is my body" in one way rather than another, ground for branding as heretics the excellent and zealous men who could not see in it what they saw, seemed the acme of narrowness and bigotry. The principle of interpretation which Whately accepted, and which seemed fair to all parties, is thus stated by Mr. Ward:—

"If after we have employed our utmost pains on the right interpretation of Scripture there remain any doctrines fairly disputable, any practices the advocates and opponents of which can equally appeal to Scripture as justifying or condemning them, then we may be sure that those doctrines and practices are really unessential and indifferent, and that every man must be content with holding his own opinion about them in perfect tolerance of the opposite opinion entertained by his neighbours."[1]

But a far higher influence than Whately's was that of Dr. Arnold. His sermons had early attracted Mr. Ward from their high and unworldly tone, and his influence grew more potent from the time when Mr. Ward's friendship with Arthur Stanley—Arnold's favourite pupil—commenced in 1834. It was a directly spiritual influence and not, as Whately's had been, mainly intellectual. Fairness and sincerity were but the skeleton of a religion, and it needed flesh and blood to clothe it. There were deep cravings after a high moral ideal which a merely intellectual system could not satisfy. From childhood the idea of working for God's cause in the world had, as we have seen, inspired him, and he could not rest satisfied until he had found a teacher who could touch his heart as well as his intellect. This need Dr. Arnold supplied.

He had all the breadth of sympathy and dislike of unreality which had attracted Ward in Whately's writings—though perhaps less of logical force;—and he added to these an intensity of ethical earnestness and an elevation of moral purpose, which were deeply influential on his new disciple. His influence was personal and spiritual. It was the influence of a high character testifying by life and by action rather than by argu-

[1] *British Critic*, vol. xxx. p. 339.

ment to the substantial truth of his teaching. Here was not only a protest against unreality and inconsistency, but the positive inculcation of a rule of life, of the practical ways of carrying out of the Gospel precepts, and utilising all religious belief in the struggle for God's cause in the world. It was Mr. Ward's first introduction to ascetic religion,—to enthusiasm for self-discipline and self-improvement. The Rugby boys—W. C. Lake, now Dean of Durham, Arthur Stanley, Arthur Hugh Clough, the poet, with whom Ward was intimate at Oxford—were a sort of flesh and blood argument for the powerful living force of Arnold's religion. The inconsistency in the current Christianity between the language of the orthodox preacher in the pulpit, and the practical standard aimed at or even revered by the average Churchman, was at least minimised by Arnold. He preached to his pupils practical lessons on the actual duties of their state of life, and the standard aimed at by them was identical with the standard held up in his sermons. The subtle faults of pride, hypocrisy, unkindness, contempt for the poor, idolatry of worldly success, substitution of ambition for the sense of duty as the mainspring of action in life, and so forth, were made matter for practical self-examination; and at last Ward found religion directly and exclusively connected with the acquirement of personal holiness. The religion of respectability—the punctilious, external, lifeless, decorous, church-going Protestantism, self-satisfied, censorious, easily-shocked, to which he had been accustomed—had always been distasteful to him. Religion seemed to him purely a personal and internal matter, and perhaps at that time he made less account than later of the value of example, and of the effect of external practices in introducing spiritual ideas and habits. If he found that going twice to church on Sunday led him to be less attentive, and made his Sunday on the whole less profitable, he would go once only, heedless of the comments of those around him. His conscience was most self-accusing, and he was a severe critic of himself. But once he had satisfied himself that a particular course was right he thought little of the opinion of others; and in later years, after he had joined the Catholic Church, the numberless practices of goodness and self-denial which were habitual to him, and which he found more useful

than some of the ordinary services, were known only to a few most intimate friends. Arnold's inculcation, then, of personal religion, and comparative disparagement of forms, attracted him as being a protest against conventional Protestantism. "For years," he writes, "consciously or not, and in various shapes not recognised by me at the time as modifications of the same symptoms, had my feelings been oppressed and (I may really say) tortured by this heavy, unspiritual, unelastic, prosaic, unfeeling, unmeaning Protestant spirit; all the time my ears were stunned with the din of self-laudation, with the words 'pure and apostolical,' 'evangelical truth and apostolical order,' and the like most miserable watchwords."

But Arnold's teaching was a protest too against Newmanism as he then conceived it. The religion of the Tractarians seemed in a different way from ultra-Protestantism, but still equally, an external religion. He looked on it as characteristically antiquarian—filling the mind with legends and traditions, many of them incredible myths, and peopling the imagination with the romantic, and with visions of a shadowy and useless character, while neglecting the really important offices of religion. The sacramental and sacerdotal ideas, too, were to him distasteful and unreal—substituting an artificial sacredness for the sanctity of personal goodness. It was not until he had become acquainted with the ascetic side of Catholic teaching that this view changed. Arnoldism, then, by its rejection or disparagement of all in religion which did not directly tend to bring the soul nearer to God and further from sin, was to Ward a wholesome antidote to both these kinds of formalism. "The great idea," he wrote, "which Dr. Arnold seems to have grasped and to put forth in every variety of shape in his sermons, is the duty of doing all to the glory of God; of considering our daily labours in the world, the duties of our station, the part we take in politics to be as truly religious acts, and claiming to be done in as religious a spirit as prayer is."[1] Such was the state of Mr. Ward's views up to 1837. And he made those views felt among his friends and pupils, as even those attest who least understood his character or agreed with his opinions. "Ward's weight in the University was great," says Mr. T. Mozley, speaking of

[1] *British Critic*, vol. xxx. p. 300.

this time. "He represented the intellectual force, the irrefragable logic, the absolute self-confidence, and the headlong impetuosity of the Rugby school. . . . As a philosopher and a logician it was hard to deal with him." The ethical and doctrinal aspect of his Arnoldian religion is shown clearly and forcibly in a sermon written by him in 1837, which is given in full in the Appendix to this volume.[1]

Mr. Ward, writing on Arnold a little later in the *British Critic*, selects the following points in his teaching as having been especially attractive to him—his hatred of worldliness, the peculiar reality to be found in his treatment of Scripture, and his strong sense of Christian equality among those of different stations in life. The first of these laid a very deep hold on Mr. Ward. Both his keen sense of the greatness of the moral ideal and his love of consistency led him to protest strongly against the elements of preferment-hunting, of ambition for success, of measuring things practically by a worldly standard, which seemed only too common in the Established Church. Worldliness was one of those "secret sins" which were silently tolerated to a dangerous extent, however much they were condemned in the Scripture texts and prayers which were in use among all parties. Arnold brought into the region of practical life the much-needed protest against it—and not simply a negative protest, but an active spirit of opposition to it. He taught his pupils to have a pride in making a stand in society against worldliness, to despise it as unworthy of a Christian, bringing to bear a certain *esprit de corps* in favour of unworldliness which was far more effectual than any mere exhortations. Mr. Ward felt to the end of his life great gratitude to Arnold for his influence in this respect. He always considered worldliness as a most dangerous foe, because so insidious and hard to detect. The flesh and the devil were open enemies, but the world was a false friend. All men have in some degree to keep terms with it. And worldliness, under the specious appearance of knowledge of the world, or under the plea of common sense, would often obtain a footing which might afterwards grow until the spirit of this world had altogether expelled the Spirit of God. He spoke of it as "the circumambient poison," and waged against it a hearty and uncom-

[1] See Appendix A.

promising war. "I may aver with a safe conscience," he used to say, "and I thank God for it, that any power of retort or sarcasm which I have had has been consistently used by me in trying to make God's enemies look foolish, and never on the side of worldliness." His feeling about the poor and about difference of caste in general was in some sense a part of this. While always recognising external differences, and the propriety of observing the customary manners proceeding therefrom, he was delicately sensitive to the feelings of those in a different class of life, taking the greatest pains not to wound them, consulting their feelings constantly and closely, and this not as practising a special virtue, but as avoiding a most odious vice.

The following are extracts from the article in question illustrative of the points to which I have referred :—

"There is another subject . . . of which . . . this author (Dr. Arnold) has more than once treated with great piety and earnestness. We allude to the odiously unchristian way both of speaking and of thinking of the poor, which, alas! we fear it cannot be denied pervades the upper and middle classes of Englishmen. We hope and believe there are even now no uncertain appearances of amendment in this respect, but, so odious is it, that while and in proportion as it lasts it cannot but draw down God's heavy displeasure on our country. This, naturally enough, shows itself in its most coarse and offensive shape in boys at school, and (we will add) young men at the universities; and the sort of ὕβρις exhibited by scholars towards the lower classes calls forth, as might have been expected, some of Dr. Arnold's severest and most pointed censures."[1]

With respect to Dr. Arnold's treatment of Scripture he writes thus :—

"Another great excellence of Dr. Arnold's writing is his real and open-hearted way of looking at holy Scripture. To make plainer what we mean, let us confine our observation to the four gospels; though far from meaning to confine our praise to his dealings with them. Nothing seems more rare in this Bible-reading age than the habit of grasping and setting plainly before the mind, as though in a picture, the recorded events of our Lord's life; or again, of even attempting to seize the true force of the 'gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth.' The dryness and dullness with which, after all our boasts on the subject, we peruse the gospels is very astonishing. In this respect the middle ages of the

[1] *British Critic*, vol. xxx. p. 302.

Church (not to go back earlier, which would of course make the contrast far stronger) seem greatly to surpass our own. Whether the rarity and difficulty of obtaining different parts of the text of Scripture made them proportionately prized, or whether the representations of sacred things, then so common, caused the effect, or the zeal with which the different festivals were celebrated, certain it seems, that they were much more in the habit of a reverent and affectionate contemplation and realisation of the details of our Lord's life, His words and His works, than we usually are. Now in this Dr. Arnold excels. We do not say that he seems always sufficiently impressed with the feeling whose words and acts he speaks of; we do not think he does: but they are real objects with him—they appear the very frequent subjects of his thought, and he sees difficulties and seeming contradictions where more careless readers pass contentedly on, seeing no *difficulty* because they see no *reality*." [1]

I must not omit to mention a further point, in which Dr. Arnold's tone chimed in with a very deep feeling of Mr. Ward's, against one aspect of the religion current among Evangelical Protestants. His systematic lessons on the duty of self-improvement and of struggling against the lower tendencies of nature, were in marked contrast to the element of fatalism which the Evangelical party had imbibed from Luther. Realising the Lutheran principle in all its consequences he was filled with horror for it, as for the destruction of the very idea of the virtue of self-conquest. Though doubtless never fully acted on, it seemed to involve total passivity —a surrender to the spirit or to the flesh, whichever had the upper hand.

Here then were Mr. Ward's two principles of religion of which I have spoken—the intellectual principle of fairness, candour, straightforwardness, of frank discussion concerning the evidence on which belief rests, of fully realising what we profess; all this issuing in a very general toleration of dogmatic differences, and a comparatively reduced catalogue of essential beliefs; and the ethical principle involving an uncompromising stand against worldliness, a love of holiness, the idea of the glory of God in daily actions, constant attention to moral discipline and self-improvement—all this accepted as teaching which commended itself to the conscience and spiritual nature.

[1] *British Critic*, vol. xxx. p. 303.

In Dr. Arnold's own view these two principles worked harmoniously together. By free inquiry into the Scriptures he gained just so much dogmatic belief as sufficed to form a basis for his ethical precepts. But Mr. Ward soon came to hold that Socinianism, nay atheism itself, had enough to say for itself, if the principle of inquiry were that of "candid intellectual criticism," to shake the certainty of Dr. Arnold's conclusions. Arnold interpreted Scripture according to the critical method, and elaborated therefrom a plausible scheme of doctrine. But how about the previous question, the inspiration of Scripture? How about the proofs of revelation? How about the existence of God Himself? This much was at least clear that on such questions a candid and full examination into all views was a work beyond the reach of the mass of mankind, and one requiring more time than that of ordinary human existence. An opinion might be held on portions of the subject, but to decide with certainty on the whole was, on such principles, impossible for the average inquirer.

Mr. Ward states the case with characteristic vigour in the *British Critic:* "For our own part," he says, "we should be inclined to say that, on a very moderate computation, five times the amount of a man's natural life might qualify a person endowed with extraordinary genius to have some faint notion (though even this we doubt) on which side truth lies."[1] Some higher and more direct principle, then, than this of "free inquiry" and "private judgment" was needed. Free inquiry itself led to uncertainty at best; and if there were no surer method of knowledge its result must be a species of Agnosticism—the view that nothing certain can be known as to the very fundamental truths of religion. Mr. Ward's belief in the intellectual principles of Arnoldism failed him, and for a time his opinions were in a state of *flux*, and the future course of his speculative mind was uncertain. But his conviction of the essential truth and value of Arnold's ethical teaching, so far as it went, did not waver,[2]

[1] *British Critic*, vol. xxxiii. p. 214.

[2] After joining the Tractarians he writes of this teaching, "In proportion as it is realised it may be made the foundation on which any amount of true doctrine may be reared."

and under the various influences, of which some account shall be given directly, he was led to recognise first that the basis of his trust in Arnold was mainly a moral basis—resting on the intuitive perceptions of the spiritual nature, and next that this basis, if fully realised, involved principles which would lead him to recognise conscience and not intellect as the supreme guide in religious inquiry. Conscience was the primary informant, as being directly conversant with the moral nature of the individual, and with the first principles which that nature implied, and also as giving him instinctive trust in others whose moral perceptions were wider and truer than his own.

And here we have in reality the underlying principle of his progress from Arnoldism to Newmanism. The change which seemed so fundamental was really logical, and was the carrying out of principles rather than the change of principles. His earnest and constant cry was in spiritual matters, "Give me a guide." "A deep cry," he writes, "is heard from human nature, 'Teach us the truth, for we cannot find it ourselves, yet we need it more than aught else on earth.'" Again and again he quoted Carlyle's saying, "True guidance in return for loving obedience, did he but know it, is man's prime need." The great note which attracted him towards a religious teacher was personal sanctity. "The moral faculty," he wrote, "is not left to its own unaided powers; for one of the very earliest lessons it teaches us is the perception of superior goodness; and the duty of reposing an ardent and loving trust in the dictates of that goodness." And again, "Holy men are the great fountains from which moral and religious truth flows to the world: if a revelation be given they are the authorised interpreters; if there be a living authoritative tribunal, their spiritual experience furnishes materials for the decrees of that tribunal; if no special revelation, on them must the task be imposed of collecting and discriminating the various scattered traditions which are afloat in the current of human speculation."

On these principles an ethical system or a spiritual authority which, as such, seemed higher and more thorough than Arnold's, had a *primâ facie* claim on his allegiance, and such a system he eventually found in Mr. Newman's teaching. It was opposed to Arnold's intellectual system, but that system Mr. Ward could no longer accept. It was not opposed to, it

was the more complete carrying out of the high and unworldly morality which Arnold inculcated.

And another thought, too, associated with these points, must be referred to as having paved the way for acceptance of the elaborate doctrinal creed of Newmanism, a creed which laid such stress on those very minutiæ of dogmatic beliefs which liberalism treated as unreal and unimportant. His original tendency had been, feeling the difficulty attending on all proof in matters of doctrine on the one hand, and on the other the absolute and undeniable reality of the conscience and the moral law, to minimise the former, and to insist on the latter. But when as time went on he came to feel that that very *minimum* of doctrine which was necessary as a support and sanction to the moral law must fade away before the consistent application of the latitudinarian intellectual principles, the question presented itself: May there not be after all some indissoluble connection between the plenitude of doctrine and the highest morality? Those dogmas which I have looked on as burdens, may they not be after all as helpful to the full development of the moral life as belief in God's existence is indispensable to its first rudiments? Then following on this came the conception of Church authority as the external embodiment of conscience, completing and defining both in religious knowledge and moral precept what conscience traced faintly and imperfectly: recognised by men of good-will as the vicegerent of God in the world: confirming with a directly divine sanction those reasonings from Scripture which by themselves had seemed so imperfect, just as the arguments for God's existence seemed imperfect without the clear confirming voice of conscience to seal and secure them.

The following extracts will suffice for the present as illustrations of the two lines of thought I have just spoken of, his view of the sceptical results of the principle of free inquiry, and his view of the instinctive trust reposed by the conscience in superior sanctity as the lawful means of advance in religious knowledge. After challenging the various schools within the Church of England to aver that they have really done their best to do justice to the plausibleness of the Scriptural texts adduced in behalf of views other than their own, he declares that in the absence of such an effort "the

texts you adduce are not really the grounds of your belief; the two are as it were stereotyped in your mind together; you learn your doctrines and you learn your texts to prove them like an undergraduate preparing for an examination." The real basis of their belief, he maintains, is not free inquiry, but something else. How much doctrine, then, will free inquiry really support? He asserts that *no* religious belief really rests on it; that no believer holds to his belief by means of the mere intellectual balancing of its *pros* and *cons*.

"Joining ordinary Protestant with Socinian," he continues, "let me further ask them: Have you fairly investigated the origin and authority of the Bible? Have you done any justice to Schleiermacher's view, and Paulus's view, and Strauss's view? Or otherwise, how can you blame those who believe as you do without Scripture proof when you believe Scripture itself without any proof? . . . And now to consider the school itself of Schleiermacher, or of Paulus, or of Strauss. Surely if they proceed on unconsidered presumptions they are of all men the most unreasonable: for it is their very boast that they probe things to the bottom; and it is the very reproach they cast on others that the world at large proceeds on an unreasoning faith. Now in all their criticisms on the sacred volume they assume, of course as a matter beyond dispute, the doctrines of Theism. I would ask, have they ever systematically examined those doctrines? Have they ever made the deliberate and methodical attempt to resist the incalculable influence which they well know must be exercised on their judgment by all the prejudices of early habit and education, to do full justice both in their reason and in their imagination to such arguments and sentiments, *e.g.* as those of M. Comte, and, in fine, only to believe in God with that degree of belief which the preponderance of the argument on that side justifies? . . . And now let us seriously consider to the best of our ability the chief question of all: how much knowledge should we really possess if this principle were consistently carried out? Consider the solemn truth Theism of which I have just been speaking, what are the grounds on which we receive it? Now I will allow for the moment far greater force than I believe to be justly due to the argument from final causes; and I will waive the reasoning which I used (elsewhere) to show the necessity of consulting the conscience for so much as the very idea of God. Still Paley's argument cannot be considered to prove much more than God's power and wisdom; qualities which, in fact, we believe Satan to possess in great excellence. But what are those attributes of God which really interest ourselves as moral and rational agents? Goodness (I mean His being the perfect con-

centration and embodiment of our scattered and unconnected ideas of the good and the beautiful), justice, mercy. Now when we consider the fearful amount of suffering mental and bodily which exists in every direction, even after giving its fullest weight to Paley's ingenious plea, we cannot profess with the slightest colour of plausibility that from the visible creation alone we should obtain a belief in the Creator's infinite love for man and for His creatures; while those other attributes—goodness and justice—have nothing even commensurate with such arguments as Paley adduces. And in the last place, where in the natural world shall we see indications of God's personality?"

The second extract has reference to the possible sources of modification of religious opinion, on the hypothesis that a sensitive and cultivated conscience will be instinctively drawn to higher and truer religious teaching, when such teaching shall come before it. He puts the case of one who

"has come to the knowledge of some (to him) new and surprising system; or has become acquainted with the person or writings of some distinguished individual; or in some other way has been brought to the perception of a range of external ideas, which reveal to him depths in his own heart formerly concealed from his observation; which are the objective embodiment of truths floating hitherto in his mind unrecognised, nay, unsuspected; or which promise the satisfaction of feelings and needs of which up to this time he has been unconsciously conscious. If indeed those truths which he has already recognised and appropriated be not also a real and solid portion of this new system he can give to it no implicit trust; and thus we see one most important protection against the temptation of dreamy sentimentality or the deceit of unreal speculation. But otherwise after due and cautious deliberation, or very possibly indeed by an almost unperceived process his confiding allegiance will be transferred to this new authority, the object varied, the sentiment of trust the same."

Lastly, the conscience *becomes* sensitive to a higher and truer religious system in proportion as its commands are obeyed. This he develops in a MS. sermon preached in 1839.[1] These commands may come in the form of direct intimations from our moral nature, or in the form of injunctions from those to whom God has given authority over us. In

[1] The date given in the text is approximate. The sermon bears no date, but it is in a book of MS. sermons the earliest of which is dated 1837; while from internal evidence it must have been written after he joined the Newmanites. Some more extracts from the sermon are given in Appendix B.

either case obedience is the appointed path to religious knowledge. He defines the power of obedience as follows:—

"Obedience by itself will [not] lead [men] into all the truth, though it will rescue them from error. Those who obeyed the Baptist's preaching ever so faithfully did not find out Christ's doctrine for themselves, but they received and acknowledged it when He came. They found that in His teaching and in His very bearing and manner which answered to the wants and cravings they felt within them, and which declared unto them what they had ignorantly worshipped. And so, though in ever so diminished a measure, God's truth, spoken though it be by fallible man, has, on the whole, in it that voice of God which is recognised by his elect—by those who have trained themselves in such obedience as I have described. . . . Obedience comes first, knowledge afterwards. It is by being pure in heart that we see God, not by seeing God that we first become pure in heart. . . . Obedience is the very air in which religious faith lives; without obedience it languishes and dies. . . . He who learns the truth from argument or mere trust in men may lose it again by argument or by trust in men; but he who learns it by obedience can lose it only by disobedience."

So much, then, as to the intellectual elements involved in Mr. Ward's change of position,—in his adoption of Catholic dogma and his acceptance of the conceptions of the Church Universal and Church Authority. From the first these beliefs seemed to him far more congenial to the Church of Rome than to the Church of England; but the Movement held out prospects of an English Church very different from that in which he had been brought up, and, with certain qualifications in his adherence to the teaching of the *Tracts* which shall be detailed later on, he surrendered to the powerful influences around him in Oxford, and joined the ranks of Newman's party.

## CHAPTER V

### CATHOLIC INFLUENCES

I HAVE now to give some account of the various external circumstances and forces which had their share—and a very considerable share—in the process of Mr. Ward's conversion to Newmanism.

Some of his earliest religious impressions were derived from the Catholic services which he attended occasionally in London during the early years of his Oxford career. He was familiar with the Roman breviary, and was drawn both to its poetry and to the principle of ever-living commemoration of the saints which it embodied. The descriptive elements in the Catholic liturgy, too, and its variety, attracted him; and again, the systematic discipline of the Church and the simplicity of her logical position were intellectually points in her favour. He had early learnt to dislike the Reformers, for whom Arnold himself had little respect, and found enough in Milner's writings to lead him to condemn the Reformation. He affirms in a letter to Dr. Pusey, which shall be cited later on, that he had contemplated the possibility of becoming a Catholic, in his dissatisfaction with the Anglican Church even as interpreted by Arnold, before he had seriously thought of attaching himself to the Tractarian party. All this deserves to be called attention to in forming an estimate both of the length of time during which Catholic influences acted on him, and the nature of his subscription to Newman's *via media*.

Next in order must be mentioned a visit to Dr. Arnold at Rugby, in which the doctor failed entirely to convince Mr. Ward as to the logical validity of his position, and increased his follower's general dissatisfaction, and the sceptical difficulties

which haunted him. This event was often related by Mr. Ward in later life, with a full appreciation of the humorous elements in the incident, and of that side of it which told against himself.

Dr. Arnold, busy all day with the routine of school-work, came in the evening, pretty well tired out, to discuss as he could Mr. Ward's sceptical difficulties and intellectual problems; while the younger man, who had sat on the sofa reading novels all day, brought to the discussion not only his special habits and endowments as a dialectician, but the freshness of an unexercised brain. The result was that Arnold not only failed to satisfy him, but was himself so exhausted, that on Ward's departure he had to spend a day in bed. Ward went away, however, thoroughly dissatisfied with his intellectual position, his sceptical difficulties weighing on him more heavily than ever. It was about this time that a new personal influence was suddenly brought to bear on him under the following circumstances.

The movement of Newman and Pusey, as I have said, had originally seemed in his eyes to tend towards the substitution of formalism and antiquarianism for true religion. At one time he and Tait considered the *Tracts* so harmful that they seriously thought of organising an "opposition" publication. He used to say that he well remembered his father telling him of Newman's ill success in some attempt, and adding the remark, "with your hatred of Newman and Pusey this will please you;" and the late Professor Bonamy Price, Arnold's friend and *collaborateur* at Rugby, in some notes made a little later of his recollections of this period (which shall be quoted soon at greater length) says that when pressed to go and hear Newman's sermons he used to say, "Why should I go and listen to such myths?"

This frame of mind was abruptly brought to an end under circumstances described below by Mr. Price when, on hearing Newman preach for the first time, he found in his tone and teaching all and more than all of that exalted ethical character which had won him to Dr. Arnold. The devotion to antique rule, the love of unreal supernatural legend, the advocacy of superstitious rites as all-important, which had in his mind been the essence of Newmanism, did not appear at all, and

the idea of holiness as the one aim was the pervading spirit of the whole sermon. Ward's intellectual convictions were not consciously changed, but his whole *animus* was; and henceforth the Movement attracted instead of repelling his moral nature. The following are the notes by the late Professor Price to which I have referred, and which he kindly allowed me to reproduce here:—

"Ward of Balliol is a man of great power. He came up to Oxford a Benthamite, a believer in virtue being the greatest happiness of the greatest number. In fact, he was a Rationalist. He was Fellow of Balliol not long after 1830.[1] He was a very energetic talker of great power of reasoning. . . . His chosen field was the region between religion and scepticism. He felt little scruple in winning over converts to Rationalism by very elaborate assaults in sophistry. After a while John Henry Newman [commenced] the Tractarian movement. He was vicar of St. Mary's, Oxford—the Church of the University also. He preached regularly on Sunday afternoons at five o'clock from St. Mary's pulpit. His sermons, as is well known, excited an interest as widely spread as it was keen amongst his audience—eager to hear more, sharply stirred up by the genius, the delicacy and subtlety of thought, the intense religious feeling, and above all by the flashes of unspeakable mystery which pervaded his utterances. The excitement they created scattered waves of feeling far beyond the precincts of the University. Ward was often pressed to go and hear them, but he impetuously refused. 'Why should I go and listen to such myths?' What he heard of the nature and effects of these sermons revolted him. At last one of his friends laid a plot against him. He invited him to take a walk and brought him to the porch of St. Mary's Church precisely as the clock was striking five. 'Now, Ward,' said he, 'Newman is at this moment going up into his pulpit. Why should you not enter and hear him once? It can do you no harm. If you don't like the preaching you need not go a second time, but do hear and judge what the thing is like.' By the will of God Ward was persuaded and he entered the church. . . . That sermon changed his whole life."

That moment was indeed the beginning of a personal influence on the part of Newman which only increased as life went on, and which no other man either before or afterwards could equal. Many years later, when as Catholics

[1] Mr. Price is not quite accurate as to his dates. Ward came up to Oxford in 1830, but was not Fellow of Balliol till 1834.

they had diverged on matters of Ecclesiastical policy, Mr. Ward wrote to him, "Ever since I have been unable to act with you I have felt myself a kind of intellectual orphan." Still the personal charm in its first as in its last stage did not involve intellectual agreement. Mr. Ward remained unconvinced. The scheme which Newman proposed—to restore to the Anglican Church in some measure the discipline and doctrine of the Fathers—was bold and captivating to his imagination; but it seemed to Mr. Ward to be bolder and more drastic, in the change it must in consistency require, than its authors were aware. It was plain to him that nothing short of an explicit avowal that the principles of the Reformation were to be disowned and its work undone could meet the logical requirements of the situation. And the leaders hesitated to go thus far.[1]

Newman attacked the whole question of the fundamental theory of the Movement in the remarkable lectures already referred to, which he delivered in 1836 in Adam de Brome's Chapel. Mr. Ward attended these lectures assiduously. The theory of the *via media* was for the first time explicitly drawn out, but it stopped short at the point where Mr. Ward's difficulty lay. It did not deal directly with the Reformation of the sixteenth century. There can be little doubt, however, that as the lectures proceeded the attraction both of the lecturer and his principles grew stronger, and on the appearance of the first part of Froude's *Remains* early in 1838, in which the Reformation was avowedly condemned, and its condemnation tacitly[2] adopted by the two editors, Newman and Keble, Mr. Ward acknowledged to himself the direction which his views were taking. "From that time," he wrote to Dr. Pusey, "began my inclination to see truth where I trust it is." The final influence which determined his conversion was the series of lectures by Newman on "The Scripture proof of the doctrines of the Church," published afterwards as Tract 85. Newman in these lectures dealt with the philosophical basis of latitudinarianism on the one hand, and of the Anglo-Catholic view of the Church on the other, with a power which did not fail to

[1] Letter to Dr. Pusey quoted in Chapter VIII.

[2] I say "tacitly" because their avowed acquiescence first appeared in the Preface to the second part of the *Remains* published in the following year.

give satisfaction to his new disciple, and to justify on intellectual grounds the position which was now invested in Ward's mind with all the charm of Froude's romantic conception of Catholic sanctity, the fire of his reforming genius, the unhesitating completeness of his programme of action.

The following contemporary recollections supply a few details of the change, and give graphic and characteristic accounts of some of the incidental scenes.

Lord Blachford, then Mr. Frederick Rogers, the intimate friend of Newman, writes from the point of view of the Tractarians themselves of Ward's gradual conversion:—

"I was closely intimate with the Cardinal at the time when your father was a Fellow of Balliol and either an old bachelor or a young master of arts. He was a staunch Utilitarian radical and in Church matters more, I should say, a disciple of Arnold than anything else. But the teaching of Newman and Pusey, and even more of Froude, caught hold of him by its uncompromising boldness, by its rejection of the old conservatism, and by what may be called its adventurousness—plunging forward into the sea of controversy on the platform of Church authority with all its corollaries. He used to attend all Newman's discourses, and ruminate and object. Then he used to come to me with his objections and queries. What would Newman say to this? Would he give up that? What does he think of this or that view put out by this or that person? All this as a man who wanted to be convinced. At one time I think we used to walk out together once a week discussing such matters. And I used to be amused at finding that, whereas in general you have to soften objections and put in palliatives and concede all that you can concede to an adversary, with him the most effective method of persuasion was to put out all that you had to say that was most obnoxious in its most obnoxious form and admit it all, or allow him to accept it, as far as you could *salva veritate*. He shrank from no premises if only he were allowed all the extreme conclusions from them. Probably he had other friends whom he in the same way made conduits through which he sucked in oral comments on the public Tractarian teachers of the day. I had this advantage over the rest, that if he wanted to know what Newman meant by a particular utterance or how far Newman would push a certain conclusion, I could always get from Newman all he wished to say on the matter. And of course it was a matter of importance to us all to satisfy and attract men of your father's stamp.

"Before long your father avowedly joined the movement and, as might be supposed, went forward ahead of it . . . always ἐνὶ

προμαχοῦσι and bringing on general actions with a merciless disregard of strategy.

"However, before these general actions came on I had found that as he had left the movement so the movement was leaving me behind, and had withdrawn from a current by which I did not choose to be carried away."

The Dean of Norwich contributes his recollections of the more amusing scenes connected with the lectures in Adam de Brome's chapel:—

"Mr. Newman, then Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin's, was giving his lectures on 'Romanism and Popular Protestantism' in Adam de Brome's chapel, adjoining the church, and used as a vestry. To hear these lectures, which were delivered on summer evenings, before the light faded, was the great intellectual and spiritual treat of the week. Many undergraduates were attracted to them by the silver musical tones, the simple, beautiful English, and the felt intellectual and moral power of the preacher. Your father and Arthur Stanley, who, though still an undergraduate, was his bosom friend and constant associate, the Pylades to his Orestes, used to sit side by side at these lectures, full in front of Mr. Newman's desk, and drinking in with open ear and quick intelligence every word which fell from his lips. Your good father was the most demonstrative of men—wholly incapable of suppressing any strong emotion which for the time got possession of him; and as these lectures awakened in him the strongest emotions both of admiration for their power, and (at that time) indignant repudiation of their conclusions, he put the preacher somewhat out of countenance by his steadfast gaze, his play of feature as some particular passage stirred him, his nudges of Stanley, and whispered 'asides' to him, ('What would Arnold say to that,' etc. etc.). Your father's manner and gestures were so pronounced that no one in the congregation could help noticing them; and it was well known also that the criticisms, which the demonstrations gave expression to, were at that time unfriendly. Mr. Newman, however, proved equal to the occasion, and at the lecture immediately succeeding one at which Ward had been specially demonstrative, we found the benches of the congregation turned side-ways (as in college chapels) so that he and Stanley could not, without turning their heads askew, look the preacher in the face."

Dean Scott,[1] who saw Mr. Ward daily in the common room at Balliol, notes some points of interest as to the impression produced on his friends by the change which Froude's *Remains* wrought in his attitude:—

[1] The late Dean of Rochester.

"The change to Newmanism," he writes, "was apparently very sudden; but probably more in appearance than in reality. The suddenness was like that of a plant which appears above ground after a period of germination below. For instance, I very well remember those lectures of Newman's in Adam de Brome's chapel in St. Mary's, which he and Stanley used to attend assiduously. They went there avowedly as hostile critics. But I do not doubt that those lectures were telling on him all the time more than he himself was conscious of. . . . What I recall most distinctly and can speak of most confidently is the result produced by the publication of Froude's *Remains* (first two volumes). Whether I myself heard his remarks on them, or whether they were repeated to me by one who did hear, I cannot venture at this distance of time to say. I think that I heard them. But anyhow I can speak with perfect assurance of their purport. They were substantially these: 'This is what I have been looking for. Here is a man who knows what he means and says it. This is the man for me. He speaks out.' But though we were amused and gave him credit for having achieved the feat which the pseudo-scholastic doctor ascribes to the angels, of passing from one extreme to the other without passing through the middle, I do not really think that those words indicated the actual turning-point. As I look back on them they seem to me to imply that the turn had taken place, but that he was looking for a pledge on the part of those to whom he was attaching himself that they were in earnest and knew what they meant."

The appearance of Froude's *Remains* was indeed an epoch in Mr. Ward's life. "The thing that was utterly abhorrent with him," writes Lord Blachford, "was to stop short," and this was precisely what the *via media* with all its attractiveness had hitherto appeared to do. All this was changed when Froude's outspoken views were adopted by the leaders. "Out came Froude," writes Mr. Ward to Dr. Pusey, "of which it is little to say that it delighted me more than any book of the kind I ever read." "He found in Froude's *Remains*," continues Lord Blachford, "a good deal of his own Radicalism (though nothing at all of his own Utilitarianism or Liberalism) and it seemed *literally* to make him jump for joy."

There was a good deal in Froude's open speech and direct intellect which resembled Mr. Ward's own characteristics different as the two men were in many respects. Newman describes him as "brimful and overflowing with ideas and views," as having "an intellect as critical and logical as it was speculative and bold," as "professing openly his admiration

for Rome and his hatred of the Reformers," as "delighting to think of the saints," "having a vivid appreciation of the idea of sanctity, its possibility and its heights," "embracing the principle of penance and mortification," "being powerfully drawn to the medieval Church but not the primitive." All this might be said with great truth of Mr. Ward himself. The boldness and completeness, the uncompromising tone of the *Remains* took hold of Mr. Ward's imagination. Authority in religion was the avowed principle. A clear, explicit rule of faith was thus substituted for perplexing and harassing speculation. There was no temporising, or stopping short. Mr. Ward's dislike of the current system was echoed in the plain statement which he was for ever quoting. "At length (under Henry VIII.) the Church of England fell. Will she ever rise again?"

Froude's writing, then, recommended itself to Mr. Ward as having the attribute of Lord Strafford's Irish policy. It was thorough. And in opposition to this Arnold's system stopped short at every turn. Froude's picture of the medieval Church was that of an absolute, independent spiritual authority, direct, uncompromising, explicit in its decrees, in contrast with the uncertain voice of the English Church with its hundred shades of opinions differing from and even opposed to each other. Instead of groping with the feeble light of human reason amid texts of uncertain signification, he interpreted Scripture by the aid of constant tradition, and of the Church's divine illumination. The stand for moral goodness against vice and worldliness was witnessed in the highest and most ideal types of sanctity in Church history. The personal struggle of the ordinary Christian against his evil inclinations was systematised and brought to perfection in Catholic ascetic works. The doctrine of a supernatural world and supernatural influences was not minimised, as though one feared to tax human powers of belief; it was put forth in the fullest and most fearless manner. Angels and saints, as ministers of supernatural help, were recognised, and their various offices in aiding and protecting us and listening to our prayers on all occasions forced on the attention constantly, in the Catholic system. There was no mistiness or haze or hesitation. All was clear, complete, definite, carried out to its logical consequences.

On the other hand Arnoldism seemed at every turn to stop short;—however excellent and true its ethical principles might be as far as they went. Intellectually it stopped short. It professed to base all its dogmatic beliefs on the principle of free critical inquiry. This principle led, as we have seen, in Mr. Ward's opinion, to scepticism pure and simple—only Arnold would not carry it out consistently.[1] He stopped short, and allowed the moral faculties to be indispensable in bearing testimony to the fundamental truths of religion. But, Mr. Ward argued, if to the fundamental why not to others? If it is true that "Blessed are the pure of heart, for they shall see God," why should not superior sanctity give truer and deeper insight into Scripture? Why may it not be said that, as holiness is a witness to spiritual insight in the one case, so it should be in the other? And here Newmanism, insisting on the interpretation of the saints in all ages, on the accumulated spiritual insight of centuries, seemed to have strong ground indeed to rest on.

Again, practically, Arnoldism stopped short. It loved to keep the supernatural at a distance. It tolerated the mysteries which, as it were, do not force themselves on practical life—the Trinity, the Incarnation; it shunned those which challenge constant and immediate attention—the protecting office of angels, the mysterious gifts of the priesthood, the Eucharistic presence. And ethically it stopped short. It feared the full gospel precepts, "Be ye perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect," "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" It had no saints. It watered down Christianity to what seemed more practicable for the average Christian than Christ's own teaching. His uncompromising ideal was modified and partially suppressed.

This line of criticism is to be found in many of Mr. Ward's writings at this time. The following extracts may suffice as samples:—

"He (Dr. Arnold) has made . . . the plainest avowal of orthodoxy on the great truths of the Trinity and Incarnation; but it is plain that belief in a Deity once, eighteen hundred years ago, incarnate, or now in mysterious Trinity governing the world as it were at a distance and by fixed laws, neither startles the reason

[1] *British Critic*, vol. xxxiii. p. 208.

nor irritates the imagination of minds of a certain class in the same degree as the news of unearthly and invisible agencies surrounding their common life, and closely encircling them on all sides. It may be that disbelief in the latter class of doctrines is inconsistent with the hearty reception and appropriation of the former, but it need not perhaps lead ultimately, quite certainly in Dr. Arnold's case it has not hitherto led, to explicit denial of them. But such truths as the following (by way of example) are either practically neglected by Dr. Arnold or plainly opposed."[1]

He proceeds to enumerate six heads of deficiency—(1) The full realisation of God's particular providence for individuals. (2) Of the value of simple prayers and obedience on the part of members of the Church in promoting her true well-being. (3) The real efficacy of intercessory prayer. (4) The reality of our communion with the saints departed. (5) The constant presence and assistance of the angels of God. (6) The awful and mysterious gift imparted to us in the Holy Communion.

He then proceeds:—

"Now what is the practical effect of Dr. Arnold's omission of these and similar most consoling and transporting truths? His sermons will no doubt be of great use to that large class who are blessed with unfailing health and unflagging spirits, who take with pleasure to a life of active employment, who have warm and kindly but not deep affections, or who live naturally with a view to excellent and honourable, yet not romantic objects. These will derive doubtless great benefit from his preaching; afterwards they may be led on by other guides to a fuller knowledge of the gracious scheme of redemption, and towards that specially Christian character of mind which Dr. Arnold's teaching is, we are persuaded, unable to create. But it is far otherwise with those whom sorrow or long sickness have disgusted with the world and with active life, or who, having warm and affectionate feelings, have been placed by God's providence where there are no adequate human objects on which to rest them, or who by their very disposition are 'keenly alive to the bitterly unsatisfying nature of earthly things,' and are filled with a restless thirst for some unknown good, higher and more noble than the world around them, with unceasing aspirations after a scene of action more filled with the romantic and marvellous than at least the ordinary course of daily life can offer them. Such persons as these will find no rest in the exhibition of Christianity which the present volume [of Arnold's *Sermons*] would offer them. The thirst for something deep and true, to satisfy the cravings which arise from

[1] *British Critic*, xxx. 304.

the causes we have referred to, in Dr. Arnold's own language, 'will not be allayed by a draught so scanty and so vapid; but after the mirage has beguiled and disappointed him for a season the traveller presses on the more eagerly to the true and living well.' Yet it has ever been the especial triumph of the Church in her full development to reconcile all dispositions to the plain duties of practical obedience, and that, not by forbidding or checking such feelings as those just alluded to, but by guiding and directing them, and giving them their full scope in the performance of those very duties.

"Where Catholic Christianity is purely taught, the more gentle and sensitive will be rescued from their tendency to a dreamy and unsatisfied indolence. There is not one of the many marvels which it teaches us, that does not in its place both raise the soul to heaven, and also stimulate and comfort it in its appointed sphere of earthly toil. Take, for example, that doctrine referred to above, which Dr. Arnold has pronounced not to be practical, and, therefore, not revealed in Scripture, viz., that angels are sent forth specially to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation—Is not the sympathy of angels as much to be enjoyed in the most busy as in the most lonely scenes; nay, is it not *forfeited* by disobedience to the call of duty? And the thought of them, in proportion as it is dwelt upon and realised, will satisfy the needs of the most tender and most solitary heart; not as leading it to rest on them as the highest and adequate object for its affections, but as united with other parts of the Catholic doctrine and discipline to train it towards a habit, differing in kind not in degree from any attainable in the Protestant schools, both of love of God and the sense of God's love through His Son.

"And so, on the other hand, the more keen-minded and ardent, who under Protestant systems, if *well* principled, are cruelly oppressed through life with consciousness of deep feelings destitute of adequate objects whereon to rest, and if *not* rootedly well-principled, are tempted to a course of what may be called enthusiastic profligacy, have not been so overlooked by God in His pure Gospel. They need not go out of the routine of daily life in search of the marvellous and supernatural; it may be that they have plain duties to perform, which forbid them to go out of it; let them only ponder and meditate on the mysteries which surround them in it. In the plain homely circle of common duties, their heart is not less the scene of combat between good and evil spirits than it would be in the wildest and most daring ventures; they are not less a spectacle to angels; they are not less by every small act of self-denial or self-indulgence acting for good or for evil on the fortunes of the universal Church."[1]

[1] *British Critic*, xxx. p. 306. In the same essay will be found illustrations of the other points of contrast noted in the text between Arnoldism and Newmanism.

Again he desiderates "something much more like ἄσκησις" than Arnold's system supplies in order to attain to the very end he proposes of doing all for God's glory. "I mean of course," he adds, "not chiefly bodily discipline, but a watchful and incessant contest with our old nature, carried through all the minutiæ of life." And he instances the careful and systematic self-examination inculcated by the devotional books of the medieval Church. Arnoldism, it is true, advocated a system of self-improvement refreshingly opposed to the Evangelical idea of passive surrender to spiritual or unspiritual influences of which I have already spoken. But Catholic asceticism was a more complete antithesis to it. Its work was more systematic and more thorough.

With respect to the principles advocated by Arnold for the interpretation of Scripture, Mr. Ward cites a passage from his sermons which runs as follows:—

"We maintain the sufficiency of private judgment in interpreting the Scriptures in no other sense than that in which every sane man maintains its sufficiency in interpreting Thucydides and Aristotle. . . . And we contend that, as by this process we discover for the most part the true meaning of Thucydides and Aristotle with undoubted certainty, so we may also discover, not indeed in every particular part or passage, but generally, the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures with no less certainty."

On this Mr. Ward comments at length, and sums up his commentary with characteristic vigour:—

"We [Tractarians] maintain that the true sense of Scripture is handed down from age to age by tradition, and that the witnesses to it profess no more than to deliver what they have received; also that private individuals depend more or less on the word of those more holy than themselves, who assure us that they go on continually to find greater accordance between the written and unwritten word. This is objected to as injurious to the liberty of the private Christian, as savouring of priestcraft, as disrespectful to Scripture itself. What does Dr. Arnold substitute? There is a school of Protestants indeed, differing from [him] on this head not less than ourselves, who say that reading the Scriptures is as it were a sacrament, by means of which the Holy Spirit guides each Christian into true doctrine. We cannot encumber ourselves at present with further allusion to this view; but we must frankly confess that, untenable as it is, it seems to us both more religious and intellectually deeper than that contained in the volume before us.

But what does Dr. Arnold and those who think with him in this matter substitute? He attacks the prophetical office of the Church as founded by the Apostles, and gives us as our prophets grammarians and philologists. Humble believers are to look for Christian truth from lips, not of those who are better Christians, but better critics; not of those who have more experience in holy living, but in manuscripts and Greek constructions; not of those who succeed the Apostles, but of those who succeed 'Porson and Hermann.' O most hateful and unchristian tyranny! Is it possible to proceed in a tone of calm criticism, however great and sincere our respect for the writer, when such chains as these are attempted to be forged for the little ones of Christ, and that by one who professes especial zeal for their liberty?"[1]

But most of all the purely personal character of Arnold's system—its entire dependence on his own personality, weighed on Mr. Ward. It was Arnoldism rather than Christianity. Newman called in the fathers of the whole Christian Church of all ages as his fellow-teachers and fellow-interpreters of Scripture. Here was personal sanctity exhibited in mutual support, corporate sanctity, one saint testifying to another and supporting his claims. But Arnold, however great and good, did not invoke such fellowship, and expounded his views confessedly on his own sole authority. On this Mr. Ward wrote as follows in the *British Critic*:—

"De Maistre, in speaking of that arrogant pretension to exclusive religious purity so common in Englishmen, and which is certainly grossly offensive in the eyes of foreigners; . . . says that the English seem to imagine 'que Dieu soit incarné pour les Anglais.' So we may say—we hope with no profaneness, and with rather a different application—that, if our author's representation of Christianity were true, we must consider that our religion was founded for the special benefit of Dr. Arnold, unless indeed all mankind were counterparts of Dr. Arnold, which they most certainly are not. But if this seems rather more than he would himself claim, what remains but a strong presumption that the system whose wisdom he praises so highly, and which he seems able with undazzled eyes to behold in its length, breadth, and depth, is rather, little as he thinks it, the unconscious development of his own religious character than the doctrine of the Bible—in a word, that he makes his system first and then praises it?"[2]

I have now referred to the main causes ascertainable both

[1] *British Critic*, xxx. pp. 344, 345.

[2] *British Critic, loc. cit.* 304.

of his dissatisfaction with Arnoldism, and of his acceptance of the Anglo-Catholic theology; and it seems plain that both Froude and Newman had their share in the work from different sides. Froude seems to have aroused his enthusiasm, and given him a zest for a system so thorough, and a scheme so drastic, for the reformation of existing Anglicanism; while Newman's lectures touched the intellectual springs of his discontent with Arnoldism, and suggested the lines of that new philosophy of religious inquiry which he developed later in the *Ideal of a Christian Church*. That this philosophy was consciously adopted by him in its entirety at the time of which I am writing is not certain, but traces of it appear in his earliest contributions to the *British Critic*, and these must be cited in conclusion as the nearest attainable account of the intellectual principles with which he began his Anglo-Catholic life. They were written two years after he had joined the party of the Movement.

"Real increase," he wrote, "of spiritual knowledge can be obtained in one way only; the more perfect development of the spiritual life. In proportion, as this advances, the creeds and other teaching of the Church will acquire a fuller and deeper meaning. The Holy Scriptures, which contain enclosed within them the same doctrines, will . . . also more faithfully disclose their general scope and tendency, the relative importance of their several parts, and their real and perfect correspondence with that scheme of doctrine which God entrusted equally with them to the Church's safe keeping, and which we from the first were bound to receive on faith at her hands. On the other hand, this advance of the spiritual life cannot proceed equably and healthily without some guide external to the individual; he cannot be otherwise preserved from narrow-mindedness and idiosyncrasy; from laying undue stress on circumstances accidental to himself, and overlooking others far more essential and common to all. . . . Nor can this external guide be adequately supplied otherwise than by some living source . . . therefore was the Church set up 'the body of Christ, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all,' endued with power sufficient, if rightly employed, to ensure her purity and faithfulness, and charged, among other duties, with preserving for her children what may be called the apostolic atmosphere, in the midst of which she began her being, in the midst of which the Books of the New Testament were written, and in the midst of which, therefore, and there only, they will exhibit their genuine colours."[1]

This state of things has, however, been modified since the

[1] *British Critic*, xxx. 333.

schism of the sixteenth century. Still it is not as though it had never been. There remains the accumulated spiritual knowledge of the Church in the past. And as this was due to the presence of the Holy Ghost in holy men of old, so we may look now to holy men of these days to bring back that Catholic spirit which is essential for understanding Scripture, and which is our refuge from the uncertain and insufficient interpretation of private judgment. The doctrine which supports holiness of life must be true doctrine, even though good men externally profess heresy. But constant and consistent holiness will, by degrees, clear the spiritual vision of teacher and learner alike, and will lead to an explicit recognition of Catholic truth. "No mathematical axiom," he writes, "is more certain than this moral one, that where the fruits of holiness show themselves there is the Holy Ghost, and there is really true doctrine; for a doctrine which supports men's spiritual life, the principle on which they live, may very easily be true, while the language in which they have learnt to clothe it may be to almost any extent erroneous and dangerous. We do not wish to extenuate the evil arising from profession of false doctrines; it must to a certain extent—in some more, in others less—vitiate the principle itself within them; . . . [moreover] of this we are well convinced that, in proportion as our obedience keeps pace with our convictions, we shall learn to appreciate the far higher holiness which has ever, on the whole, accompanied the profession and explicit belief of Catholic doctrine, we shall fall back on Catholic tradition as feeling it the correlative of our nature, and shall be rescued from the delusive and heretical sophisms of the Protestant schools."

It will be seen later on how these views developed into the conception of a still living and infallible Church as our safeguard against the aberrations of private judgment—a conception really required to complete the principles here sketched. The extracts given above were, as I have said, written in 1841, while he still clung in some sense to the *via media*, and had still vague misgivings as to the corruptions of the Roman Church. "No one branch," he writes in the same year, ". . . retains the faithful image of primitive doctrine;" and we have to balance "the excesses of one part against the practical deficiencies of another."

I have said above that there were attractions for him in Catholicism from the point of view of religious tastes, over and above the more serious elements in his conversion; and I must now speak of this further. His love of the *ethos* of Catholicism, and for the Catholic liturgy, and his "detestation" of much in the existing establishment, were very prominent and characteristic features. His feelings on some of these matters of doctrine and devotion were like physical feelings. When his mind was absorbed in any matter of important speculation there was a similar result. Writing on the difficulties arising from the apparent unfairness of human probation in many cases, he says, "it gives me a kind of physical pain to think of it." Again there is a story of his discussing the Thomistic theory of grace, which, he maintained, must, in its extreme form, lead logically to Calvinism, and of his having afterwards a nightmare, dreaming that he was a Thomist, throwing off his bedclothes, and waking up half stifled by the sense of oppression, of deprivation of will and power, which the doctrine implied.

And similarly the Anglican communion service, beautiful as he found its prayers, *oppressed* him from the obligation it involved of his following at another's pace and in another's train of thought. He often went to the Catholic chapel in Spanish Place to mass instead—long before he joined the Puseyite party. The music and solemn ceremonial raised his feelings to God, and he could choose his own train of religious thought and prayer. He considered that for himself the greatest freedom in the form of his devotions was necessary to make them profitable. A public prayer, which did not appeal to him, led to irritation and distractions. A long sermon, or too long service not suited to his taste, would "bore" him so much, he said, that he came out in a state of rebellion against God, for inflicting on him something so intolerable, rather than nearer to God. He did not deny that in limits such things might be good as opportunities of enduring patiently what was irksome. But with his temperament the irksomeness was in some cases so intolerable that such occasions were purely and simply occasions of irreligion. The Anglican service made him often feel so "wicked," he said, that he abstained from taking the sacrament. "If only I might go to

the play first," he maliciously said to an Evangelical friend, "I should feel pious enough; but the communion service makes me impious." He refers to this subject frequently in his writings of the period immediately succeeding that of which I am now speaking. "Religious ordinances," he says in the *British Critic*, "may be either a support or an oppression; either mould the spiritual life or repress it and stunt its growth; and so far as they belong to the latter category their very object is perverted, that object being, not to increase the difficulties of doing good, but to diminish them. Perhaps one of the most striking instances that can be named of this abuse is in the Kirk of Scotland, where the whole external duties and appliances of religion seem to consist in coming each Sunday twice to church, in order to hear a long extempore prayer, and a still longer sermon; of which regulation it is perhaps not too much to say that some persons of right religious principles and keen religious feelings might find life hardly endurable under so heavy a burden."

The so-called formalism of Catholicism was quite different, consisting either in the expression of natural feeling on the part of the congregation, as when the congregation kneel in silent prayer after Christ's death in the "passion" has been read on Good Friday, or in the illustrative representation in the liturgy of religious mysteries, which in no way interfered with freedom in the form of their devotions on the part of the faithful. "The real fact is," he says, speaking of Catholic churches, "that their alleged formalism, when contrasted with our practical system, mainly consists in this—that the people are not restrained by forms, that they are allowed and encouraged to vent their warm devotional feelings in such external acts and gestures as naturally express them, instead of being bound by harsh and cruel custom to an exterior of polite indifference, a cold, cramping, stifling uniformity."

Of the intense satisfaction which he was afforded by the aspect of the completeness of system in the medieval and modern Catholic Church—of the excellent organisation of her dealings with dogmatic, ascetic, and moral theology, with political and practical life, with all branches of spiritual and worldly vocations, the contemplative temperament, the active temperament, the various worldly callings, her explicit contem-

plation of the rules, precepts, counsels to be given in each case, and of the new satisfaction which this promised to his never-ceasing apostrophe, "True guidance for loving obedience,"—I shall speak more in detail when treating of *The Ideal of a Christian Church.*

From the extracts already given from Ward's writing, it will have been seen that he did not consider historical investigation to afford a sufficient basis for the choice of a particular form of Christianity, any more than he considered the external evidences sufficient proof of Christianity itself, or the standard arguments from design and a first cause sufficient proof of God's existence. But he is equally explicit in each case in allowing some confirmatory weight to these considerations, when they are enlightened by the instinctive religious perceptions to be found in our moral nature. Thus the broad historical argument that ultra-Protestantism could never have been silently corrupted into Popery had its effect on him, and on his general attitude towards the Tractarian Movement, giving it a fresh probability and plausibility to his mind; but the personal influence of Mr. Newman, and the appeal to conscience and intellect alike of the Catholic Theology as represented by him, following on his destruction of the Latitudinarian position, were far more influential. The details of the historical inquiry were, he considered, beyond his capacity so far as giving any positive judgment went, and his trust in Mr. Newman in such a matter was far more confident than any independent opinion to which the utmost study would have led him. Indeed history being one of the subjects on which he delighted to profess total ignorance and total want of capacity, it is not probable that he would ever have allowed that he had a right even to an opinion on purely historical grounds. But once he was led to his new creed by considerations external to the critical study of history, its consistency with a true view of history must follow; and Mr. Newman's account of this view was accepted with that docility which, in matters on which he did not consider himself competent, was as remarkable as his almost combative independence of thought in matters of abstract speculation or of logical consistency. Mr. Bonamy Price, whom he consulted before taking finally the step of uniting himself to Newman, was entirely at a loss to understand this. His own

mind being of a most opposite description, he was unable to look on Ward's procedure in leaving the historical side entirely to another—the aspect of the case most prominent in his own views of religion, and in which he had adopted all the old-fashioned Protestant prejudices—as anything short of deliberate self-deception. Ward was, he thought, captivated by Newman, and therefore had determined to join him. If facts did not square with Newmanism *tant pis pour les faits.* He writes the following recollections of his interview:—

"I received a letter from Ward which stated that he was on the point of changing his religious views, but that before carrying out the change he wished to discuss with me the religious elements involved in this grave matter. He hoped, therefore, that I would be willing to receive him at Rugby as my guest for a week which would allow time for a thorough examination of the principles at issue. I replied that it would give me great pleasure to welcome him at my house and to do my best to carry on the discussion, . . . so accordingly he came.

The first day passed very pleasantly, and the discussion proceeded smoothly. On the second day, to my infinite surprise, Ward broke out suddenly with the remark, 'Had I known beforehand the treatment I was to receive here I should never have come.' I was thoroughly taken aback. I exclaimed, 'Have I been rude or discourteous, my dear Ward? I had not the slightest intention of being so, but if I have I will ask for your forgiveness most sincerely.' 'Oh, dear no,' he rejoined, 'but you have been eminently disagreeable.' . . . Undoubtedly his remark was true; I had been very disagreeable and I could not help it. But why and how? I had discovered that he had come down, if I may say so, to play a trick literally, not on me but on his conscience. He had resolved under the inspiring influence of Newman's preaching to adopt his view of religion, but he had neither time nor inclination to analyse the problem to the very bottom, so it occurred to him to go down and have a talk with 'that Protestant Price.' He would say to himself that his arguments were all rubbish, and so he would be able to effect the conversion with greater ease and confidence to himself. On making this discovery I saw clearly what had to be done. I resolved to personate that conscience which he was trying to silence. I put myself in its place and asked those very questions which he wanted to shirk. I said to him, 'You assert that a certain fact occurred, and a certain doctrine existed at the very beginning of the Church different from the opinion held in the Protestant Church of England; have you examined the evidence on which you make that objection?'

'Oh, dear, no,' he replied. 'Then why do you adopt it?' 'John Newman says it is so.' After a while he again brought forward a doctrine built on alleged fact, which differed from the view taken in the English Church. Again I asked, 'Have you searched out, and can you state the evidence on which you contradict the view you have hitherto held?' Again the answer, 'No,' rolled from his lips, and again he took his stand on what Newman said."

As to the philosophical grounds for his change Professor Price says that he was obliged to reply to Ward, "You are threatening me with infidelity." Some more questions followed, all ending in the same answer. "Therefore I remarked: 'Then Newman is your sole authority. His word is the only thing you stand upon. Has he worked a miracle on which to claim your assent?' It was then that he spoke the angry words which put an end to the whole discussion."

It was a curious instance of intercourse between two men whose minds lived in different atmospheres. It was as though a fish and a dog attempted to find a common meeting-ground. To Ward abstract reasoning was everything, and to Bonamy Price it was nothing, while the historical questions involved were all in all to Mr. Price and purely bye-questions to Mr. Ward. To Mr. Price the statement that Arnold's principles logically led to infidelity, and therefore must be false, was a "threat." It did not come before him as an argument. So, too, the power of Newman's teaching as appealing to the highest ethical instincts was a whim and a fancy to Mr. Price. To Mr. Ward it was the voice of God *versus* human speculation; to Mr. Price it was a taste or a prejudice *versus* dispassionate reasoning. The view that history was not a sufficiently clear oracle to speak decisively on such a matter, and Mr. Ward's consequent readiness to be guided through its mazes to a view accordant with the doctrines which possessed his moral nature, seemed to his friend to border on dishonesty. The reason which admitted the limits of its own capacity, was, in Mr. Price's eyes, no reason. The surrender to a principle above reason was to him the triumph of unreason. He concludes his account of the matter as follows:—

"Ward after this soon joined Newman and his friends, the Newmanites as they were called. The powerful sermons remained masters of the field. Ward submitted his reason to the

magic of those wonderful words: the principle that virtue was the greatest happiness of the greatest number was thrown to the winds, and with the submissiveness of a little child the great intellect abandoned a mass of strongly felt convictions, and at once embraced new and unexamined principles which changed the whole life of the man. The conversion was moral, spiritual, but in no sense intellectual. It is generally supposed that Ward was the chief instrument which decided Newman to join the Roman Church."

## CHAPTER VI

### EARLY FRIENDSHIPS

MR. WARD was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Oxford while he was still a follower of Dr. Arnold. The question of subscription to the thirty-nine articles came before him at this time as a very practical matter, for he had adopted fully the liberal theology of Arnold's school, the extremely undogmatic nature of which it seemed difficult to reconcile with such definite doctrinal formulæ. He reconciled himself, however, to the situation on the ground that men of such opposite theological opinions subscribed, as to give the sanction of universal custom to the most forced methods of interpretation. The Hampden controversy in 1836, also, called attention to the question of subscription. Dr. Hampden had, as we have seen, advocated a relaxation in the religious tests imposed by the University, with a view to the admission of Unitarians to its degrees and honours. The censure on his views, promoted by the Puseyites and passed by Convocation, was strenuously opposed, as we have already said, by Mr. Ward's party.

When he presented himself for priest's orders, more than two years later, all was changed. The articles were subscribed in the Catholic sense, and his interpretation of Protestant clauses was as unnatural as his previous explanation of many of the dogmatic clauses. The anomaly and inconsistency of the English Church were forced anew on his attention, for although the two extremes were rarely united in one man within so short a time, yet each of the positions Mr. Ward had adopted was a common one within her pale, and neither seemed in the least accordant with the *prima facie* spirit of these formularies.

Ward continued to be Mathematical Lecturer at Balliol

from his election in 1834 until the year 1841. During this time he formed many friendships both with his pupils and with brother Fellows which had their effect on his subsequent career, and of which some account must here be given. Among the pupils who were most intimate with him may be named Arthur Stanley and Arthur Hugh Clough; and among those who, though in a lesser degree, were still considerably under his influence were Jowett (now Master of Balliol), W. C. Lake (Dean of Durham), Coleridge (Lord Coleridge), Northcote (the late Lord Iddesleigh), Goulburn (Dean of Norwich), and Temple (Bishop of London).

He appears to have been, in the words of the present Dean of Durham, above all things "a great centre of intellectual life" to his pupils.

"From the year 1835 to 1841," writes the Dean, "*i.e.*, during the whole period of his tutorship at Balliol, no tutor in Oxford seems to me to have had so much intellectual influence over his pupils as W. G. Ward. It was no doubt in some respects an influence of a peculiar kind, and was perhaps mainly due to his extraordinary intellectual activity and animation; for these were so great that even when a friend or pupil entirely declined to follow him to his practical conclusion he was for a time held, as it were, in the tight grip of his logic; and his points were so forcibly and unhesitatingly put—though sometimes it might be said paradoxically—that they left their traces upon many of us for life. I should add that this was more strongly felt in Balliol than in the rest of the University. It was the few who lived familiarly with him over whom he obtained this strong intellectual influence; on the rest of the University his influence was rather that of the ideas which he scattered broadcast. . . . His relations with some of his pupils, especially Stanley and myself and afterwards (still more closely) with Clough, were almost solely those of an intimate friend. Both Stanley and Clough he indeed absorbed to an extent which was far from popular with their friends. His whole life may be said to have consisted in his conversation, and to us younger men it was to a wonderful extent powerful and attractive. One might almost say that he was the last of the great conversationalists,—at least I have never met any one at all like or equal to him since—and held a place in a different sphere, and with much younger men, like that which S. T. Coleridge occupied in the eyes of Frederic Maurice and Sterling, at Highgate."

His powers of discussion had had exceptional training in his undergraduate days. "He had developed," writes the

STANFORD LIBRARY



Dean of St. Paul's, "in the Oxford Union and in a wide social circle of the most rising men of the time, including Tait, Cardwell, Lowe, Roundell Palmer, a very unusual dialectical skill and power of argumentative statement—qualities which seemed to point to the House of Commons." But it was chiefly as Fellow of Balliol that he exercised these powers of exhaustive debate so freely on the phases of religious opinion which I have already described. "He might have been one of the earliest of the Broad Churchmen," continues the Dean of St. Paul's, "he might have been a Utilitarian follower of Mr. J. S. Mill. But moral influences of a higher kind prevailed, and he became in the most thorough-going, yet independent, fashion a disciple of Mr. Newman." And the various first principles and consequences, involved in these different schools of thought, were forcibly and openly pressed on the attention of the conservative Oxford of fifty years ago.

With his friends—equals and pupils alike—he discussed constantly every conceivable subject, grave and gay, human and divine. This habit continued in its measure through life; but there are indications in the recollections of his friends of a certain diminution of his unreserve in this respect after he had joined the Tractarians in 1838. Before that time he used not unfrequently to shock his companions by the freedom with which he would discuss questions of religion. And this openness was stimulated by the strong element of intellectualism which pervaded his religious belief, and his consequent reduction of everything to first principles. The frank debates he entered on as to what grounds we have for considering Scripture to be inspired, as to the arguments for God's existence, nay, as to the imperative nature of the moral law itself, seemed to many rationalistic and irreligious. What he considered ordinary candour they looked on as profane. "He was a rationalist," Mr. Bonamy Price plainly says in referring to those days. Mr. Wynell Mayow tells me that he used to advocate such an alteration in the blasphemy laws as would allow of the very freest discussion among intellectual men concerning all religious and irreligious theories. It may readily be imagined that this temper of mind was startling and upsetting to the old-fashioned Churchmen; and Mr. Ward did not improve matters when, on being remonstrated with for thus

attempting to settle with the human reason matters belonging to the province of faith, he abruptly asked, "Pray, then, can you tell me the difference between faith and prejudice?" After he joined Mr. Newman he was far more particular in avoiding language or habits which any could criticise as profane. The whole idea of edification by outward example never became very congenial to him, but it was noticed that he brought himself to attempt it far more after he had joined the Movement. He became, too, generally more careful about externals. It was observed that he took more pains with his dress—although to the end of his life such endeavours did not meet with any high degree of success.

As to his moral influence over his pupils—which, in spite of his opposition to all that savoured of the "sanctimonious," seems to have been very real—there was no lesson which he loved more to impress upon them than what Catholic devotional writers call "purity of intention." The Dean of Durham speaks of the influence of his own example in impressing this lesson—from "his candour, his singleness of purpose . . . his high example of purity and religious sincerity." He taught his pupils to look at success in the schools or even in the career each had chosen for life, as quite secondary in comparison with elevating and purifying the character. Intellectual excellence, keenly as he appreciated its pleasures, never commanded his respect except in that department—large enough, it is true,—in which it was employed in throwing light upon the great moral problems of human life, or on the moral nature of individuals. Great as was his incidental intellectual influence, he never wearied of insisting that intellect was a means and an instrument, not in itself an end.

Mr. Ward likewise made direct endeavours to bring religious influences to bear on all the undergraduates with whom he at all came in contact. And he was ably seconded in his endeavour by the Rugbeans at Balliol, who had already imbibed Arnold's *ethos*, and also by the high-minded and religious tone of many of the other Fellows. Tait, Scott, and himself[1] used as each freshman came up to arrange amongst themselves that

[1] Mr. Ward, although as mathematical lecturer he had not *ex officio* a share in this work of supervision of the undergraduates, was asked by the tutors to co-operate with them in it.

one or other should look after his moral and religious training. The mentor so appointed asked his protegé to breakfast to meet a good set of undergraduates, and thus gave the newcomer every chance of falling into good hands. If the young man had good stuff in him the plan generally succeeded; but if, after a time, it was evident that he preferred to go his own way, and to keep clear of the tutor's influence, he could of course do so. Those who did in this way surrender themselves to Ward's influence, and became his occasional walking companions, seem almost universally to have preserved a grateful remembrance of the benefit they thereby gained. Lord Coleridge, writing to him forty years later, says:—"I never think of those old days at Balliol and of the kindness I had from you, and of the benefit I believe I got from you, without a glow of heart. I never have forgotten those walks and talks and never shall forget them;" and Professor Jowett, Mr. Lonsdale, Dr. Temple (now Bishop of London), and many others bear a similar testimony. And it is remarkable that such intimacies and influence in many cases lasted after very wide divergencies had grown up between him and his friends in matters of Ecclesiastical opinion. This was notably the case with Stanley, Jowett, and Tait. Mr. Ward never would allow any such divergence of opinion to obscure his view of the excellent qualities of character which he admired in those from whom he differed most. Long after he had identified himself with the most *ultra* form of Newmanism, and Stanley had adopted a scheme of liberalism more extreme than that of his master Dr. Arnold, Ward, when taken to task for keeping up such an intimacy, by a friend who refused to believe that he could have real moral sympathy with one who was so far from what he considered "the truth," replied that such moral sympathy was in truth the great bond between them; that it was not a mere fascination of intellect or manner, but Stanley's "extreme and unusual simplicity of character, joined with very strict conscientiousness according to his lights," which appeared to him "so attractive."[1]

But while his influence seems to have been entirely for good over those whose danger lay either in flippancy and want of seriousness, or in worldliness and personal ambition, and while his hearty and undisguised contempt for such faults acted as a

[1] In a letter to a friend, dated January 1845.

powerful moral tonic on them, it was not simply beneficial in other cases. An anxious over-scrupulous mind was in danger of being upset by the root and branch destructiveness of Ward's philosophical speculation, and in some cases he unsettled such minds in their religious belief without being able afterwards to convince them of the soundness of the Catholic creed, in which he himself ultimately found the antidote to scepticism. This was the case with one of the two men with whom his friendship was closest and his intercourse most unceasing—with Arthur Hugh Clough. The sceptical element in Ward's views never affected Stanley, but on Clough it produced serious and lasting results. Stanley was, indeed, at one time captivated by the principles of the Movement, and it was Ward's opposition which kept him back from making common cause with the Newmanites.[1] In the event, however, when Ward himself had made up his mind to join them, Stanley was fairly launched on his intellectual career, and had adopted fixedly the views which his subsequent history confirmed and developed. One who has every right to speak with authority on the subject writes: "I suspect from Stanley's whole character that the adhesion to Newman would have been a very temporary one," and certain it is that in fact neither Ward's Anglo-Catholicism nor his scepticism obtained any permanent footing in the mind of his friend. Archbishop Tait gives his own account of this in a sketch of Stanley published in *Good Words*:—

"When Stanley first arrived," he writes, "Ward was a devoted disciple of Dr. Arnold, ready to push every one of his theories with remorseless logic to any conclusion however startling; and it soon appeared that he startled himself, and, like many others since, was ready to make a sudden bound from limitless speculation to the narrowest bonds of ecclesiastical authority. Fortunately he did not convince Stanley, who was thrown greatly in his intimacy, either of the accuracy of his sceptical inferences or of the propriety of the antidote by which he sought to neutralise their effect.

"It used to be said that Ward's logic was irresistible if he only had a fact as the foundation on which to construct his argument. . . . It might naturally have been expected that Stanley, subjected to an influence so potent as Ward's, would from the vein of poetry in his nature, from his love for all that is picturesque, as well as

[1] See Letter from the Dean of Durham, Appendix C.

his susceptibility to the enchantment of every old historical scene reproduced, have yielded to the prevailing spell. It was a time when Newman reigned supreme in the University, and captivated the most promising of its youth by the freshness of his persuasive fancies, clothed in the purest and most forcible style of writing and of speech. The very appearance of the man had in it something to attract and subjugate, and seemed to carry his admirers back to the ages in which his spirit lived, and which he sought to reproduce in a modern world.

"It is remarkable that these powerful influences altogether failed to attract Stanley. . . . His own early training in a Whig household, in which liberalism was the very breath of the whole family; his connection from his boyhood with all that was eminent in the Liberal camp in politics; the far deeper influence of the great religious Liberal chief to whom he owed his intellectual training; something also in his own nature abhorrent from the then fashionable 'doctrine of reserve' which draws an unfair distinction between esoteric and exoteric teaching; all these combined to secure him."

With Arthur Hugh Clough it was otherwise. He came under Mr. Ward's influence at a time when his conversion to Newmanism was imminent, and the tutor put upon his pupil more of the pressure natural to a partisan than could have found place in his early intercourse with Stanley, when his opinions were comparatively undecided. Both the lines of thought apparent in Mr. Ward's discussions had their effect on Clough, but in the wrong order, and in the wrong relative proportion. The Newmanism which saved Ward from scepticism was the line which first influenced Clough; the scepticism was the stronger and later force of the two. The history of this intimacy deserves to be gone into at some length, both from the interest attaching to Clough's remarkable genius and character, and from the influence on his own moral life which Ward always attributed to the friendship. With the single exception of Newman, whose reign had then hardly begun, Mr. Ward was not so deeply attached to any of his Oxford friends as to Clough, and of course his relations to the two men were opposite in character. He was considerably Newman's junior and his disciple; whereas Clough was his pupil, and for a time tended to adopt his ethical and religious views. To the very end of his life he spoke with the tenderest affection of Clough, although the latter's sceptical development in later days led to a divergence between them, and their

paths in life separated. After Clough's death he wrote to Mrs. Clough, who had asked him to send her some memorials of their Oxford intimacy: "I infer . . . that you and he were under the impression of my affection for him having passed away. There cannot be a greater mistake; my heart swells now when I think of him." There was to the very end a strange mixture in Mr. Ward's feeling about him, of admiration and love for his noble and straightforward character with pain at the later phases of his religious history. Indeed, in one of his letters he vindicates the latter by an appeal to the former. He avows his intolerance towards Clough's free thought, and maintains that Clough would approve of such intolerance as an integral part of the religious position Ward had honestly adopted. "For," he writes, "he was always forward in vindicating the paramount claims of what one honestly regards as vital truth." He adds, with much feeling, "I am often tempted to think that these deep divergencies of principle are the greatest evils and sufferings of life."

Their friendship began immediately on Clough's coming up to Oxford. In one of his first letters written from Balliol to his friend, J. P. Gell, in January 1838, he says, "I am great friends with Brodie, and still more so I think with Ward, whom I like very much," and for a time their sympathy in elevation of character and in their high view of the purpose of life, was a sufficient bond to counterbalance the effect of such intellectual differences as existed between them. Ward loved the freshness and delicacy of Clough's genius and delighted in his society. He often recalled the happiness of his first visit to the lakes made in Clough's company in 1840. Clough, he used to say, *interpreted* scenery for him. Ward loved natural scenery almost as he loved music, though his eye was not accurate and he could not explain the features which struck him. When first he and Clough came in sight of Grasmere, coming suddenly upon a view of the lake from behind the hills, Ward was fairly overcome and burst into tears.

For a time their intercourse continued in unclouded peace, but gradually the element of philosophical scepticism in Ward's view of religion—his destruction of the old-fashioned natural theology, his denial of its sufficiency to give intellectual conviction as to the very first truths of religion, began to tell on

Clough, and to set his naturally speculative mind thinking anxiously; while the principle of religious knowledge which Ward substituted, did not finally commend itself to him. The result was great perplexity on his part. The current comment in Oxford when Clough and Ward were seen walking constantly together, was: "There goes Ward mystifying poor Clough, and persuading him that he must either believe *nothing* or accept the whole of Church doctrine."[1] For a time, as I have said, Clough tended towards the Tractarianism to which Ward was attaching himself; but he ended by rejecting it without ever recovering the peace of such religious convictions as had been shaken in him.

The following selections from Clough's letters at this time give some evidence of the anxiety which this phase of his life caused him:—

"If you were to come here," he writes to a Cambridge friend in November 1838 "(as I hope you will do after your degree is done with), you would at once have Ward at you asking your opinions on every possible subject . . . you can enumerate; beginning with Covent Garden and Macready, and certainly not ending till you got to the question of the moral sense and deontology. I don't quite like hearing so much of these matters as I do, but I suppose if one can only keep steadily to one's work (which I wish I did) and quite resolve to forget all the words one has heard, and to theorise only for amusement, there is no harm in it. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel, in a very good University sermon last Sunday on the 'Duty of Private Judgment' as opposed to the right, seemed to say that undergraduates were to mind their Latin and Greek and nothing else, or nearly so."

Again, a little later, writing to another friend at Cambridge, he says, "I truly hope to escape [in the long vacation] from the vortex of philosophism and discussion whereof Ward is the centre; and I assure you I quite *makarise* you at Cambridge for your liberty from it."

Mr. Ward himself, looking back thirty years later at those days, wrote the following account to Mrs. Clough of his general impressions of Clough's character and of his own influence upon him:—

"You ask me to send you some reminiscences of your husband's

[1] I quote this from a private letter of the present Dean of Westminster.

Oxford life, at the time when he and I were most intimate. It is a subject to which I can do no kind of justice, and I cannot indeed give any true account of it whatever without saying more about myself than I at all like. I will say nothing, however, about myself except what is absolutely necessary for the purpose of illustrating (so far as I knew it) Clough's habitual state of mind. I so entirely lost sight of him afterwards (as you well know) that I shall write as though I knew nothing whatever of his subsequent career. I never read any of his works, because there was no sufficient reason for my doing so, and I feared they would give me pain; nor indeed have I any trustworthy knowledge at all of any part of his career subsequent to his undergraduate days. I will speak of him therefore exclusively as I then knew him.

"Certainly I hardly met any one during my whole Oxford life to whom I was so strongly drawn. I saw clearly, indeed, from the first how far wider were his powers and perceptions than my own, and how large a portion of his character there was (including its whole poetical side) with which, from my narrowness, I did not come into contact. But I did perceive in him many qualities which greatly attracted me. They were such as these:—(1) His unusual conscientiousness, high-mindedness, public spirit. As regarded himself, his one main desire (so far as I could see) was to do what he felt to be right, and, as regarded others, to stand up for the cause of God and of right principle. This latter view—the duty of making a stand in society for good principles—was an especial characteristic of Dr. Arnold's pupils. Many think that he impressed it on them too prominently, so as to expose them to a real danger of being priggish and self-sufficient; but certainly I never saw in Clough the faintest trace of such qualities as these.

"(2) Closely connected with this were his unselfishness and unworldliness. The notion of preparing himself for success in a worldly career was so far from prominent in his mind, that he might, with some plausibility, have been accused of not thinking about it enough. But his one idea seemed always to be that he should to-day do to-day's duty, and for the rest leave himself in God's hands. And, as to unselfishness, his self-abnegating consideration for others may be called in the best sense feminine.

"(3) Then his singular sweetness of disposition. I doubt if I have anywhere seen this exceeded. I have known him under circumstances which must have given him great vexation and annoyance; but I never saw in him the faintest approach to loss of temper.

"(4) I will not say that he gave me so strong an impression of piety and habits of prayer as some other Oxford men gave me, especially those of the Tractarian school. But at last these things are not

visible on the surface, and in him there were many signs of devoutness. It may be thought a small thing, though to me it does not appear so, but I particularly remember his way of looking at or speaking of religious pictures. He never spoke of them from a merely artistic point of view, but always in the spirit of one whose mind was fixed on the realities they represent. Like Dr. Arnold's other pupils he had far fuller grasp of the New Testament than was at all common with undergraduates; but it was peculiar to himself that he brought so much reverence and devotion to bear on his interpretation of it.

"(5) Intellectually, he struck me as possessing very unusual independence and (if I may so express myself) straightforwardness of thought. He was never taken in with shams, pretences, and traditions, but saw at once below the surface. On the other hand, he was perhaps less remarkable for logical consecutiveness. But at that time the Oriel fellowship was universally accounted, I think, the best test in Oxford of intellectual power; and he obtained that fellowship the first time he stood for it. I took part myself in examining him for the Balliol fellowship, and I do not remember to have seen so much power displayed in any examination within my experience.

"What was before all things to have been desired for him was that, during his undergraduate course, he should have given himself up thoroughly to his classical and mathematical studies; that he should have kept up . . . the habits of prayer and Scripture-reading which he brought with him from Rugby, but should have kept himself aloof from plunging prematurely into the theological controversies then so rife at Oxford. He would thus indeed have unconsciously grown clear of a certain narrowness of sympathy with which he naturally commenced his Oxford life, and would have acquired a general knowledge of what those points were which at that time were so keenly debated around him; but at the same time he would have been saved from all injury to the gradual and healthy growth of his mind and character. It is my own very strong impression, though I cannot expect you, my dear Madam, to share it, that had this been permitted his future course of thought and speculation would have been essentially different from what it was in fact. At all events the experiment was not tried. I fear that, from my point of view, I must account it the great calamity of his life that he was brought into contact with myself. My whole interest at that time (as now) was concentrated on questions which to me seem the most important and interesting that can occupy the mind. Nor was there any reason why they should not occupy my mind, considering my age and position. It was a very different thing to force them prematurely on the attention of a young man just coming up to college, and to drive him, as it were, peremptorily

into a decision upon them; to aim at making him as hot a partisan as I was myself. My own influence by itself might not have done much, but it was powerfully seconded by the general spirit of Oxford society at that time, and by the power which Mr. Newman then wielded throughout the University.

"The result was not surprising. I had been prematurely forcing Clough's mind, and there came a reaction. His intellectual perplexity for some time preyed heavily upon his spirits; it grievously interfered with his studies; and I take for granted it must have very seriously disturbed his religious practices and habits. I cannot to this day think of all this without a bitter pang of self-reproach.

"As regards his ordinary habits at the time, since I was a Fellow and he only an undergraduate, I cannot speak with certainty; but my impression is that from the first he very much abstained from general society. This was undoubtedly the case at a later period, when his intellectal perplexity had hold of him; but I think it began earlier. I remember in particular that every day he used to return to his solitary room immediately after dinner, and when I asked him the reason for this he told me that his pecuniary circumstances incapacitated him from giving wine parties, and that therefore he did not like to wine with others. I think also there was a certain fastidiousness of taste and judgment about him which prevented him from enjoying general society.

"The opinion both of tutors and undergraduates undoubtedly was that there was an unusual degree of reserve in his demeanour which prevented them from understanding him; but they all—certainly all the tutors, and, I believe, all the undergraduates — greatly appreciated his singularly high principle and his exemplary spotlessness of life.

"I have executed my task most imperfectly, and the attempt has revived in my mind various painful memories. But I am most glad of any opportunity for showing the deep affection which I retained for your husband while he lived, and with which I now cherish his memory."

The result of the reaction of which Mr. Ward speaks in this letter was, as is well known, that Clough drifted further and further in the direction of free thought, and though there are indications in his letters that their friendship did not absolutely cease so long as Ward remained at Oxford (*i.e.* until 1845), their first close intimacy was at an end. A slight element of irritation is evident in some of Clough's remarks to his friends during the latter days of that intimacy. "When I am talking to Ward," he said to Temple, afterwards Bishop of

London, "I feel like a bit of paper blown up the chimney by a draught, and one doesn't always like being a bit of paper;—so I sometimes keep away from the draught." And looking back at this period he said in later life to another friend, "Ward was always trying to put me on the horns of a dilemma; but somehow I generally managed to get over the wall." One of their last meetings on terms of intimacy was described to me by Dr. Bloxam of Beeding Priory. Newman, Oakeley, Clough, and Bloxam himself dined with Ward at Balliol. Before dinner was over the strained relations between Clough and his host became very apparent, and Clough was so evidently pained and distressed by the views of the rest of the company—all of them members of Newman's school—that Mr. Ward broke up the party before the usual hour.

As we have seen from the extracts from his letters Ward felt the separation keenly, and this was one instance of the very many in his life where he sacrificed the pleasures of personal friendship to what he considered the cause of truth. A friend of Clough's tells me that it is to this painful divergence of opinion after the first years of comparative intellectual sympathy that he referred in his beautiful poem, *Qua cursum ventus*—

"As ships becalmed at eve, that lay
With canvas drooping, side by side
Two towers of sail, at dawn of day
Are scarce long leagues apart descried;

"When fell the night, upsprung the breeze
And all the darkling hours they plied,
Nor dreamt but each the self-same seas
By each was cleaving side by side:

"E'en so—but why the tale reveal
Of those whom year by year unchanged
Brief absence joined anew to feel
Astounded, soul from soul estranged?

"At dead of night their sails were filled,
And onward each rejoicing steered—
Ah! neither blame, for neither willed,
Or wist what first with dawn appeared.

"To veer how vain! On, onward strain
Brave barks! In light, in darkness too,
Through winds and tides one compass guides—
To that and your own selves be true.

"But, O blithe breeze, and O great seas,
Though ne'er that earliest parting past,
On your wide plain they join again,
Together lead them home at last.

"One port methought alike they sought,
One purpose hold where'er they fare;
O bounding breeze, O rushing seas,
At last, at last unite them there."

A striking contrast to the absorbing friendship for Clough, with its painful associations and momentous consequences, were Ward's intimacy with Jowett, the present distinguished Master of Balliol, and his genial relations with Balliol College generally. Both these relations have been described by Professor Jowett in a letter to myself.[1] The difference between Ward and Jowett in all matters of philosophical and theological speculation was from the first as marked as their subsequent careers would lead us to expect. After a time, indeed, Ward considered the points of disagreement so vital that he refused to discuss religious subjects with his friend at all. "He bid me observe," writes Professor Jowett, "that of late he had ceased to speak to me of theological subjects because I seemed to think that there might be some important sense in which Christianity was true apart from the certainty of historical facts." Their cordial intimacy, however, was in no way interrupted. I select first a portion of Professor Jowett's recollections which relates to their personal friendship, in which the lighter side of Mr. Ward's character and interests seems to have been the most prominent, although Mr. Jowett adds that "in this assemblage of pleasant qualities there was also an admixture of seriousness which formed the basis of his character."

"All my personal recollections of your father," writes Professor Jowett, "are of the pleasantest kind. He was generous, considerate, affectionate, and rarely, if ever, was he divided from any one by dif-

[1] See Appendix D.

ference of opinion. . . . Few persons in our time have exerted a greater influence on their contemporaries than he did at Oxford when he was quite a young man. This influence was due quite as much to the kindness and large-heartedness of his nature as to the charm of his conversation and his great dialectical powers. . . . He was one of the most genial men I have ever known, and a delightful companion. When in health he was always the same, ready to laugh or join in a laugh with any one. He had a friendly word for the College servants, with whom he was a great favourite. His conversation never flagged and was of all sorts. He had a great variety of jests, anecdotes, stories of his own schooldays, or of his family, or of persons whom he had known. He was fond of reciting some mock-heroic verses in Latin and English which he had composed when at Winchester School. He had a knowledge which was prodigious of the theatre and of theatrical persons and performances, acquired by long habit when he was a boy of going to the pit; and he gratefully remembered the numberless "three-and-sixpences" which his parents had paid for him. This taste continued with him to the last. He had a great wish to meet Macready, who was a stranger to him, because he thought they would both derive so much pleasure from their common reminiscences. He would often break out into snatches of song, comic or serious, or repeat whole scenes out of the 'Olympic Devils,' a burlesque performed at the Olympic Theatre which had a great run in those days. His fine voice and his great love of music were expressive of the joviality of his nature. Things serious and profane lay near together in his mind, but they were not confused; he was never in the least degree either coarse or profane, though he might sometimes be misunderstood by persons who do not themselves understand a jest. I admit, however, that he was not indisposed to startle those who were of a different temper from his own—he had a sort of pleasure in doing so. He once took me, on a Sunday evening in the middle of summer, about the year 1839, when his change of opinions was still recent, to Mr. Newman's church at Littlemore, where he was to preach. We drove out after dinner and walked home. Two things I remember on that occasion which were highly characteristic of him. The sermon which he preached was a printed one of Dr. Arnold's, but with additions and alterations which, as he said, it would have driven the author mad to hear. This indeed was true, for the intention of them was to change the spirit of the discourse from Low or Broad to High Church, retaining what was common to both. We walked back to Oxford in the twilight, along the Iffley Road. He was in high spirits and sang to me songs out of 'Don Giovanni' and other operas, with which his capacious memory was well stored. He was not the less serious because he could pass an hour or two in this way.

"As some of your readers may wish to know what manner of man he was in personal appearance, I will endeavour to describe him. He was about five feet nine in height, dark, but of a cheerful and handsome countenance, readily breaking out into a smile, ungainly in his movements, and uncommonly stout for his age. He was very disorderly both in his dress and his apartments. The tables in his room, never well furnished, were covered with books, pamphlets, papers, tea-things, writing materials, etc. Once or twice he made an attempt, like other disorderly persons, to clear his Augean stable, but it only resulted in sending to the binder a few loose books and papers which were bound up together without regard to their subjects, and labelled '*Sermons, Operas, etc.*' These labels were declared by one of his friends to be symbolical of himself. . . .

"I have already said he was full of mirth and jollity; even when in pain he was ready to laugh and make others laugh all day long. His sayings and doings were in the mouth of every one, and, as I have compared him to Socrates in his dialectical powers, I would add that he was like Falstaff in his love of making fun. It will be understood that neither of these comparisons is to be taken quite literally. He was also 'of a most noble presence,' and his laughter, if the Johnsonian test be applied to him, was 'by no means contemptible.'"

Not less interesting is Professor Jowett's sketch of the Balliol College of fifty years ago and of Ward's relations with it, and his description of the celebrated Dr. Jenkyns, the then Master of Balliol, the subject of many of Ward's favourite stories, but the object, nevertheless, of his sincere regard—a regard which was never really impaired by the many passages at arms between them which will be recorded in the sequel of this narrative.

"Though [your father] was attached to Balliol College," says Mr. Jowett, "and had an extraordinary memory of the ways of the place and of all that was said and done there in his own time, he could never be persuaded to revisit his old haunts; he was not in Oxford, I think, after he left the English Church. But between the years 1838, when I was elected a Fellow of Balliol, and 1845, during term time I used to see him daily. . . . My contemporaries and friends in those days, Arthur Stanley, B. C. Brodie, Hugh Pearson, Arthur Hugh Clough, the Bishop of London, the Deans of Durham and Norwich, Lord Coleridge, Constantine Prichard, and others who were his friends as well as mine, though of different ages, were all, like myself, several years his juniors.

"The Fellows of Balliol at that time were a very united body,

and not undistinguished. (1) There was John Carr, the Senior Fellow, a refined gentleman and scholar, full of humorous sayings and out of the way learning, but fanciful and eccentric. He was believed to have been disappointed in love, and the disappointment seemed to have left a mark upon his character. He was grave and solitary. He used to laugh sadly as if he were taking himself to task for ever indulging in mirth. He was a sort of person who, if he had lived two centuries earlier, might have been the author of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*. He would read all the morning, and after dinner bring out of his treasure-house some quaint saying or curious anecdote, which he found or pretended to have found in a recondite or unknown author.[1] He could scarcely be said to have studied with a purpose. (2) Next to him on the list of Fellows was Frederic Oakeley, an elegant writer and a great lover of music, much respected by us. He became a member of the Roman Church about the same time as your father, and led the life of a saint among the Catholic poor in London. (3) Ten years younger than either of these, and a contemporary of your father's, was A. C. Tait, who had been a scholar and exhibitioner, and was a Fellow and Tutor of the College, full of sense, humour, and kindness,—a shrewd Scotchman, as he was sometimes thought, who at that time (between the years 1835 and 1842) devoted to the College the great qualities which afterwards made him eminent in the world. From early days it was predicted of him that he would become Archbishop of Canterbury. He was one of the few by whom high preferment was never sought, and to whom it did no harm. He was always kind and tolerant, and had something of the statesman in his nature. He never forgot an old friend, even when differences of opinion might have made it convenient to drop him. In his later years, when Archbishop, he used to pay an annual visit to the College, and to preach in the College Chapel. (4) There was J. M. Chapman, a good man, meek and gentle, but not at all learned or able, and rather prejudiced. (5) P. H. S. Payne, a man of a noble and simple character, remembered by few, for he died early; an Ireland Scholar, and a friend of the late Professor Halford Vaughan, and the present Dean of Christ Church. He was of unusual stature. (6) And I must not forget the late Dean of Rochester, afterwards Master of the College, who was very kind to me in early life, an excellent man, though not liberal or enlightened, and a distinguished scholar, possessing stores of information on a great variety of subjects,—too much given to punning, but also a real humourist. He was the author of many ingenious

[1] "One of his inventions which I happen to remember is worth preserving:—'Vera sunt vera ac falsa sunt falsa. At si ecclesia dixerit vera esse falsa ac falsa esse vera, tum vera sunt falsa ac falsa sunt vera.' This oracular saying he brought out with great seriousness as a quotation from Bellarmine."

mots, and famous for a copy of Greek Hexameters in which he described the Heads of Houses going to the installation of the Duke of Wellington; these admirable verses were long remembered and quoted in the University. These were all our seniors, and most of them your father's contemporaries, with whom he held many an argument in the Common Room, and like Socrates in the Symposium, never, I think, was worsted by any of them. There were two or three other Fellows, men who have left very pleasant recollections of themselves, such as (7) Lewis Owen, and (8) James Lonsdale,—the latter an excellent scholar and teacher, with whom he was less acquainted. In those days the conversation in the Common Room used to flow fast and freely, for several of the Fellows were good talkers in their different ways. On one Sunday, soon after I was elected, I remember [your father's] bringing his father to dine with us, 'the great Mr. William Ward' as he is still called in cricketing circles. On that Sunday it happened that his son had been preaching in Chapel on the subject of Apostasy, which led the elder Mr. Ward to discourse to us of the political Apostasy of some of his parliamentary friends. On another occasion Dr. Arnold was entertained by us in the Common Room. Your father had formerly been his friend, and had lately attacked him with considerable asperity in the *British Critic*, so that the relations between them had become rather strained, and the conversation was carried on with difficulty. Visits to the Common Room, made by Mr. Gladstone, Lord Dufferin, Lord Cardwell, a former Fellow, and other distinguished persons, are also remembered by me.

"In attempting to pourtray the Balliol of fifty years ago, I must not forget the figure of the old Master, who was very different from any of the Fellows, and was held in considerable awe by them. He was a gentleman of the old school, in whom were represented old manners, old traditions, old prejudices, a Tory and a Churchman, high and dry, without much literature, but having a good deal of character. He filled a great space in the eyes of the undergraduates. 'His young men,' as he termed them, speaking in an accent which we all remember, were never tired of mimicking his voice, drawing his portrait, and inventing stories about what he said and did. There was a time when at any party of Balliol men, meeting in after life he would have been talked about. His sermon on the 'Sin that doth so early beset us,' by which, as he said in emphatic and almost acrid tones, he meant 'the habit of contracting debts,' will never be forgotten by those who heard it. Nor indeed have I ever seen a whole congregation dissolved in laughter for several minutes except on that remarkable occasion. The ridiculousness of the effect was heightened by his old-fashioned pronunciation of of certain words, such as 'raythér,' 'wounded' (which he pronounced

like 'wow' in 'bow-wow'). He was a considerable actor, and would put on severe looks to terrify freshmen, but he was really kind-hearted and indulgent to them. He was in a natural state of war with the Fellows and Scholars on the Close Foundation; and many ludicrous stories were told of his behaviour towards them, of his dislike of smoking, and of his enmity to dogs. It was sometimes doubted whether he was a wit or not: I myself am strongly of opinion that he was. Some excellent things were undoubtedly said by him, but so fertile was the genius of undergraduates that, as in some early histories, it is impossible to separate accurately what is mythical from what is true in the accounts of him. One evening he suddenly appeared in Hall, to strike terror into a riotous party, and found that the Master's health had been proposed, and that an undergraduate was already on his legs, returning thanks in his name. He was compared by John Carr to a famous old mulberry tree in the garden, well known to all Balliol men; while of another mulberry tree newly planted Carr said: 'And that is Tait.' He was short of stature, and very neat in his appearance; the deficiency of height was more than compensated by a superfluity of magisterial or ecclesiastical dignity. He was much respected, and his great services to the College have always been acknowledged. But even now, at the distance of more than a generation, it is impossible to think of him without some humorous or ludicrous association arising in the mind. Your father and he had a liking for one another, which was, however, in some degree interrupted by their ecclesiastical differences."

Two other friendships of Mr. Ward's Oxford life must be spoken of—with Oakeley, afterwards Canon Oakeley, and Tait. After the election of Ward and Tait to Balliol Fellowships in 1834 the three men were on the most cordial terms, all of them interested in college matters, and in promoting the religious and intellectual welfare of the undergraduates. But when Mr. Ward began to attach himself to Mr. Newman a fresh element arose. Oakeley came to sympathise with Ward's new line, while Tait was as strongly opposed to Newmanism as any one in Oxford. The result could not but be painful at that eventful time, when feeling ran so high on both sides. On one side there was the unparalleled personal loyalty which Newman inspired, joined to all the enthusiasm which a religious movement in the spring of its life is calculated to arouse; and on the other the still-living Protestant hatred of popery—living even when the Established Church seemed otherwise in decay. The dread

increased daily that, under the specious plea of a return to primitive customs, the superstitions of Romanism, with their fatally corrupting and corroding tendencies, were gradually gaining a real footing in the English Church. Mr. Ward's influence over the undergraduates, too, led many of them in the Catholic direction, and Mr. Tait had to witness the "perversion" of some of his most attached friends and pupils. Still, by the unanimous testimony of their contemporaries, the cordial personal friendship remained untouched. Constant public and theological opposition on both sides went hand in hand with constant signs of personal regard and respect. Tait had conjointly with the other tutors arranged to invite Mr. Ward, who in his capacity of mathematical lecturer exercised no immediate supervision over the undergraduates, to accept an equal share of responsibility in this respect. After the appearance of Mr. Ward's first pamphlet in defence of Newman's celebrated Tract 90, at the instance of Mr. Tait the charge was withdrawn; and after the appearance of the second, again at the instance of Mr. Tait, Mr. Ward was deprived of his office of mathematical lecturer. Both steps Ward accepted without the least particle of ill-feeling. It was natural, he considered, that Tait should think his influence over undergraduates dangerous, and wish to check it; and considering that the opinions of the Master, Dr. Jenkyns, were similar, he held it to be a duty on Tait's part to act as he acted, and a duty on his own to resign his position. In a letter to the late Dean of Rochester he speaks thus of his resignation of the first position:—"From the moment the Hebdomadal board [1] had expressed an opinion, I felt it a plain duty to give back to Tait and Woolcombe the charge they had entrusted me with. It is not the writing,—the holding views so pointedly condemned by one's own Head makes it to my mind a plain duty to act as I acted. Tait happened to speak to me on the subject before I directly mentioned it to him: but he knows that from the first I intended nothing else." On the other hand a little later on, when the university authorities proposed to censure Ward for "bad faith" in his subscription to the Articles, Tait came forward in his defence and published a pamphlet [2] in which he

[1] The details here referred to are given fully in Chapter VIII.

[2] Mr. Tait's pamphlet, as will be seen, was opposed to Ward's views, and

bore the strongest testimony to Ward's sincerity and straightforwardness.

Dean Lake speaks as follows of the relations between the two men at that time:—

"Ward's chief sphere of conversation was the Balliol common room, and there, for some three years after I first knew it as a Fellow, he and the late Archbishop Tait had their almost daily and always most friendly battle. They were in different ways equally able, and, I may add, to their old pupils equally loveable. Tait, a born Scotchman, was perhaps of all men in Oxford the most direct antithesis to Newmanism, and we, some of us, charged him with being too unimaginative to understand Newman's character. He saw, too, better than most of us how things were really going, and was by no means happy in finding that many of his most attached pupils were drifting away from him. This might in ordinary men have led to feelings of theological bitterness between him and Ward; but it is a proof of the large and generous character of the two men that nothing of the kind ever occurred. And even after Tait had first roused the university authorities to attack Newman by his protest against Tract 90, and Ward had been turned out of his tutorship for his pamphlet on the occasion, the friendship of the two men continued as before—each really admired and valued the other."

In the year following the events connected with Tract 90, Mr. Ward had an opportunity of testifying in a very practical way his undiminished regard for Mr. Tait. Mr. Tait became candidate for the Rugby Head-mastership on Dr. Arnold's death, and Mr. Ward gave him the most warm and high testimonial, which was from many circumstances calculated to be influential in securing the success with which Mr. Tait's candidature was in point of fact crowned. It was couched in the following terms:—

From the Rev. WM. GEO. WARD, M.A., Fellow, and late Mathematical Lecturer of Balliol College, Oxford.

To the Trustees of Rugby School.

BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD, *29th June* 1842.

MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN—I have great pleasure in giving a testimonial to Mr. Tait, as a candidate for the vacant Headmastership of Rugby School. I acted as his colleague in the work

countenanced their public censure, but contained the strongest testimony to his uprightness of character.

of tuition in this college for a period of nearly six years, and had the opportunity of observing closely his mode of performing the duties of college tutor. On the other hand, I was slightly acquainted with Dr. Arnold, and very intimately with some of his most distinguished pupils, and for some time past have taken the deepest interest in all that concerns the welfare of Rugby School. As being well acquainted then both with Mr. Tait's qualifications and with the general system pursued at Rugby, I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion, that Mr. Tait is peculiarly well fitted to carry on there the system pursued by the late lamented head-master. Mr. Tait unites to great tact and sobriety of judgment a manly and unaffected straightforwardness both of manner and of purpose, and also an unusual degree of kindliness and affectionateness; both which latter qualities are, as I should think, and as Dr. Arnold's example seems to prove, singularly calculated to procure influence over the young. And from my knowledge of what has taken place in this college under his tutorship, I should not only entertain a confident expectation of his obtaining such influence in a school like Rugby, but I should also have a full certainty that the one great object for which he would exert it would be the training of those committed to his charge in habits of religion and strict conscientiousness. I may add, from the unanimous testimony of those who have attended his lectures here, that he has to a great extent the art of imparting information to others, and of exciting and sustaining their interest on subjects naturally dry and distasteful; and I believe him, moreover, to be a sound and accurate scholar. In conclusion it may be as well to say that I have no reason to suspect myself of undue partiality in Mr. Tait's behalf, as it has happened from various circumstances, partly from our wide difference in theological opinions, that I have never stood to him at all in the relation of intimate friendship.—I have the honour to be, my Lords and Gentlemen, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, M.A.
Fellow, and late Mathematical Lecturer
of Balliol College, Oxford."

The bond between Ward and Oakeley grew far closer, as might be expected, when they had thrown themselves heart and soul into the Tractarian cause. Mr. Mozley speaks of them as "as much associated as Damon and Pythias, Castor and Pollux, or any [other] inseparable pairs." Though the elder of the two, Mr. Oakeley seems at this time, from his gentle and more passive nature, to have been to a great extent guided by Mr. Ward. Oakeley was in those days incumbent of Margaret Street Chapel, the great centre of Puseyism in

London. Here Ward frequently preached, and otherwise bore a part in the great work done for the cause of the Anglo-Catholic movement by Mr. Oakeley in the metropolis. All the arrangements at Margaret Street were submitted to Mr. Ward's approval down to the smallest details, and it was by his advice that Oakeley abstained from preaching "advanced" dogma, confining himself mainly to discourses on moral and spiritual subjects. Oakeley, moreover, adopted to the full the theological principles which Ward developed, when towards the end of his Oxford career he headed the "extreme" party, and chivalrously identified his own with Ward's views when Convocation degraded him in 1845. One who was in those days a friend of the two men recalls some words which he overheard in 1843 or 1844, which tell their own story of the friendship between them. Ward's doctors were for a moment uncertain whether he had not on him a mortal complaint. He said to Oakeley, "It seems doubtful whether I shall live through the year," and Oakeley could scarcely speak at first, and then exclaimed, "Do not say that. If you were to die the sun of my life would be extinguished."

Glimpses of the old common room discussions and of the characteristics of the three men, Oakeley, Tait, and Ward, are given in the reminiscences of contemporaries. Mr. Lonsdale has supplied me with some anecdotes, and some interesting notes of his own impressions. Speaking of Mr. Ward's life in the common room he writes: "What struck me most was his wonderful gift of conversation, his determination to push everything to a logical end, his delight in argument, his good temper in it, his candour, his willingness to listen, his kindness to juniors and inferiors like myself, his joyousness of manner—partly natural, partly owing to his hope of coming triumphs for the Church,—his simple devotion to the great cause. . . . He threw into the common room a life and animation it would not otherwise have had." The dialectical duel between Mr. Ward and Mr. Tait seems to have been a never-failing source of entertainment before this audience. Graphic pictures are given by those who were present of trivial events, which seem, however, to bring past scenes before us. On one occasion Mr. Tait having three or four times made answers which he deemed unanswerable, but getting each time a prompt and effective

retort, bent on having the last word, goes to the common room door, fires off his last volley and slams the door before Ward's counter-fire can reach him. On another he retires discomfited to put on his surplice, as it is service time, but bethinks himself in the vestry of a crushing answer, goes back, surplice and all, to the common room and discharges it in triumph. Mr. Ward turns it inside out in a moment, and adds, amid the roars of laughter which follow his reply, "If you hadn't anything better than that to say it was hardly worth while coming all the way back in your surplice." And again there is the story of a climax in one of the arguments, in which Mr. Ward, "dialectically invincible," is deprived of his power of repartee by the intervention of unexpected physical forces. The argument is at its height, the attention of all concentrated in turn on the next move on either side, Mr. Ward comes across the room at a point in the debate, saying, "This is splendid; I will show you that you have committed yourself to three different statements totally inconsistent with each other." As he says this he leans his whole weight on the back of a chair. Before point two has been registered on his fingers, a crash is heard. The intellectual and physical weight has been too much for the chair, which collapses abruptly and prostrates the victor in his moment of triumph.

Speaking of the friendship between Oakeley and Ward, Mr. Lonsdale writes: "It was the more remarkable from their difference of manner and gifts—one so impetuous, so logical, . . . the other *distrait*, quiet, silent." They were always associated in the Tractarian "politics," and the element of eccentricity in both, yet of so opposite a kind in each, seems to have given a sort of dramatic effect to their intercourse. The contrast extended to externals, Ward's large figure, heavy tread, loud voice, hearty laugh, being the antithesis to Oakeley's spare frame, halting step, shy and reticent demeanour. If there was a sudden call to arms in the course of the Tractarian war, Ward would call out, says Mr. Lonsdale, "Come along, Oakeley," and would rush out of the common room. Oakeley would then get up, and "hop" after him. Evidences will appear in the course of this narrative of the friendship between the two men in connection with their joint action in the cause of the Movement. One more will, however,

find its place here as being purely personal. Their relations after they left the Anglican Church were for many years less intimate. Possibly forces similar to those which diminished Newman's influence over Ward had a similar effect on Ward's influence over Oakeley. Church authority may in both cases have filled the place of personal influence. Be this as it may, although there was never any real estrangement between them, their lives to some extent diverged; but during the last two years of Mr. Oakeley's life the friendship was renewed on its old terms, and a year after his death Mr. Ward referred to him in the preface to his own last publication in feeling terms.

"He has been removed from among us," he writes, "and he has left behind him (I venture to say) but few who exceed him in humility, simplicity, unselfishness, unworldliness. I have a right to speak because he honoured me with his friendship to the last, and in our Anglican days we were especially intimate. Though he was much my senior, together we pursued that course of inquiry which led us to accept (the then) Mr. Newman as our one master in religious doctrine; and together we pursued that course of inquiry which led us to the further conclusion that Mr. Newman's teaching had its legitimate issue in the Communion of Rome. Mr. Oakeley looked through sheet by sheet my Anglican work, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, before it was published; and when it was condemned, he identified himself both with the book and its condemnation. From the first he was just what his friends remember him to have been at the last: so full of public spirit and so devoted to public objects that the remembrance of self seemed literally to have no place in his thoughts. May he rest in peace."

This was written but a year before Mr. Ward himself passed away, and Archbishop Tait remained the last of the three friends who had lived during ten years of their Oxford life in such curious relations of warm personal regard and keen theological opposition. They never entirely lost sight of each other, and in Mr. Ward's last illness few things pleased him more than hearing that the Archbishop had sent to Hampstead to obtain the latest news of him. Tait himself died six months later, but not before he had had time to unite the three names in a touching tribute to the memory of past days, with which this sketch of their relations may fitly close. "Two names," he wrote with reference to the Oxford school, "rise before me

as my dearest friends. They both became Roman Catholics early in these struggles, but through the changing scenes of life I had opportunities—alas! few and far between—of keeping up my intimacy with both. One died three years ago, the other but a few months since. Two more single-hearted and devoted men I believe never lived."

One more of Ward's Oxford friendships may be referred to, —with Edward Meyrick Goulburn, now Dean of Norwich. They, too, remained to the end on terms of hearty good fellowship, though theological differences for a short time kept them apart. Goulburn in early days was an Evangelical, and Ward's freedom of speech on religious matters frequently shocked him. "Ward had a malicious pleasure," writes Dean Lake, "in assailing Goulburn, sometimes not over-reverently, for his intense bibliolatry." Still their friendliness was not really impaired, so long as Ward belonged to any school of religious thought recognised by the Anglican Church. When, however, his Romeward tendencies led Goulburn to regard him as a traitor in the camp, a coolness ensued, which lasted until Ward's actual conversion in 1845.

The two men had much in common in their keen sense of fun and in their religious earnestness; but there was, in the early days of their acquaintance, a touch of the ultra-decorous Evangelical about Goulburn in Ward's eyes, and of the irreverent liberal in Ward from Goulburn's point of view, which prevented them from thoroughly understanding each other.

The following recollections, which the Dean has kindly sent me, give sufficient indication of the relations between the two, and form a valuable supplement to the account which has been given of Ward's general habits, and of his intercourse with his friends at this time.

"Many of the reminiscences," writes the Dean, "will not bear transference to paper; they consist of jocose *dicta* or incidents, which were highly amusing at the moment, but the sparkle of which, like that of some effervescing wine, is gone as soon as they have been broached, and defies record. Much, therefore, of what I have to say in the way of bare reminiscences would not be worth putting down. But I console myself with thinking that the only value to a biographer of the reminiscences of friends is the light which these reminiscences throw upon the character of the subject of the biography; and that therefore I shall be helping you in the work

which you have undertaken by exhibiting the character you wish to pourtray at the particular angle of incidence at which it struck my own mind, weaving in, as I go along, any small anecdotes or sayings which will bear recital. And in doing this I know I need make no apology to you for not suppressing all notice of those peculiarities and eccentricities, which especially beset, I think, strong and vivid personalities such as was your father's. Certainly I should not have needed to make an apology to him for such outspokenness. For of all men whom I ever came across, he would have most earnestly wished his biographer to 'speak of him as he was,' and 'nothing' to 'extenuate.' 'Show me truly to the world,' he would say, 'or at least in a way subjectively true—according to your genuine conceptions of me.' I am not likely to err in the other extreme, and 'set down aught in malice'; for indeed, widely as we differed in opinion all our life long, I entertained a genuine and cordial affection for him, and I believe that he also was very kindly disposed towards me.

"To begin with his intellectual qualities. One of the most characteristic of them, and not the least attractive, was his excessive and almost unbounded vivacity of mind. I do not know that I ever saw this feature so strongly exemplified in any other character. Hence his strong appetite for amusement, and his keen recognition of the truth that amusement in some form or other is as essential to the healthfulness and elasticity of the mind, as food and rest and exercise are to the well-being of the body. Hence his desire and endeavour to reclaim from their alliance with the world and sin the drama and the opera, and his occasional indulgence in those forms of recreation—an indulgence which none of those who knew him well, and conversed with him on these subjects in his serious moments, will ever suppose to have tainted his mind (a very peculiar and abnormal one) with a single wrong thought or feeling; had it done so, his whole soul would have risen up in indignation against the amusement, and he would have renounced it for ever. No; it was simply that his mind was so constituted that he appreciated intensely what all of us appreciate in a measure, the relief which is to be had, under the strain of life's cares, and the pressure of hard work,—(he was always, I think, a mental hard-worker, a severe, and patient, and candid philosophical thinker) from a hearty ringing laugh at some good joke, or a piece of well-written pathetic fiction, or a strain of music, or a song; which last were his great luxuries. The vivacity and impatience of dulness, of which I am speaking, pervaded his whole character and influenced his religious views. I have reason to think that among other graver objections which made the Communion in which he had been baptized and ordained distasteful to him, one was that our 'Book of Common Prayer' does not supply variety enough, and is too

monotonous in its services (a tenable opinion, of course, but one in which I by no means concur) and that the Church of England, as her system is usually acted out by religiously-minded persons, puts too great a strain upon the religious instincts of her children. I remember that the greater variety of the Breviary Services attracted him, and was the subject of his admiration, long before he made up his mind to quit the communion of the English Church, and that one day, when he was lauding this variety, I observed that there might be a confusing and perplexing variety, and that such seems to have been the case before the Reformation, when some of the 'Churches within this Realm' followed 'Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some the use of Bangor, some of York, some of Lincoln'; but that our Reformers thought that they had done a good work in so rearranging and simplifying the services of the Church, that 'now from henceforth all the whole Realm should have but one use;'—to which your father replied with his usual *bonhommie*, rubbing his hands briskly, and his countenance beaming with good humour, 'Yes, and a precious dull use they took care it should be too.' Exuberant gaiety and vivacity of mind may doubtless be a snare, and be allowed to degenerate into levity, and frivolity, and even into irreverent and profane sallies. From remarks which your father made to me from time to time, I believe that he was aware of his own danger in this respect, and of the necessity of being more than commonly strict with himself in regard to those periods of devotion, both public and private, which he felt himself bound to observe. But it will not be denied that the gaiety and vivacity in question—the brightness and hilarity of early youth, continuing apparently undiminished in later life,—is in itself, apart from its excesses and extravagances, a most attractive characteristic. I should say that in him it was held in check by two great correctives, one, the hard work which (more or less) all his life long—as tutor of Balliol first, and in later days as Professor at Old Hall College, editor of the *Dublin Review*, and a thinker and writer on metaphysics—he was in the habit of doing, and doing with all his might; the other, the deep religiousness of his character, to which I shall advert further on. But his chief intellectual characteristic was, I think, his absolutely fearless reasoning out of principles, without ever allowing sentiment to stand in his way or modify his conclusions. I trace here a remarkable resemblance between him and one of the greatest men of our day—Mr. Gladstone. In the appendix to Archdeacon Denison's pamphlet on Mr. Gladstone there is an interesting and touching account of a conversation between the late Bishop of Lincoln and that statesman, in which the bishop expostulated with him on the disappointment felt by churchmen as to his policy, from which they had expected so much. 'He listened very patiently,' said the bishop, in recounting the interview to the

archdeacon, 'and made me two very remarkable replies.' The second reply runs as follows:—'"My dear bishop . . . all the points you have specified, and others like them, are intuitions to you and men like you, who have sucked them in with their mother's milk. They are your foundation, that upon which you build. My case, let me say, is a different case. I was born and bred in an uninfluenced habit of life; and in my case every one of these things is the produce of the working of my own mind simply."' Now, utterly dissimilar to Mr. Gladstone as your late father was in certain mental features (your father's mind, for example, brimming over with humour, of which there seems to be a great lack in Mr. Gladstone's), in this they strike me as having been remarkably alike, the guidance at all times of both of them by pure, hard reasoning. . . . And yet how large a share in any sound conclusion must be allotted to all the moral considerations denoted by the word sentiment—regard to natural affections, associations of the past, habitual and prevailing ways and modes of thought, etc.!

"Your dear father in the intenseness of his personality (I never knew any personality equally intense) caricatured several principles, capable of being maintained in moderation and within limits, one of which was the power of reasoning to settle all things. 'Why should a man be fonder of the members of his own family,' I have heard him say, 'of father, mother, brother, and sister, than of other people, or of his own country than of other countries?' If you replied, 'Nature dictates it,' he would say, 'But if *my* nature doesn't dictate it, you cannot prove that I am bound to this affection.' If one hinted at the Fifth Commandment, he would immediately acknowledge the obligation arising from this precept to show all respect and deference to parents (including, according to our Lord's own exposition, the duty of assisting and supporting them); 'but there is nothing here,' he would say, 'about liking them better than others. Let a man follow his natural bent in that respect.' . . . He cared not much how things went practically, so long as the theory how they should go was correctly laid down. Hence, while quite firstrate (from his wonderful dialectical power) as an academic disputant (oh, that I could have heard him at the meetings of that Metaphysical Society, of which I take him to have been the life and soul, which at least has collapsed since his death [1]), he would not have made a good member of Parliament. The settlement of principles too much interested and absorbed him to let him care much about practical results. This was to be regretted; for with a single fact, with which not unfrequently his friend Arthur

[1] This is not strictly accurate. Many attributed the collapse of the Metaphysical society to Mr. Ward's retirement from it through ill-health; but it came to an end *before* his death.

Stanley armed him, he would perform wonderful dialectical exploits, and do terrible execution upon his controversial antagonists. It was like arming Samson with the jawbone of an ass.

"There was so large an element of the humorous in your father, and so many things that I have to tell of him will inevitably provoke a smile, that I must on no account leave unnoticed the stern moral stuff which was one chief ingredient of his character. The vices of public schools excited in him a horror, which persons without his moral stamina would have thought excessive and unduly severe. He has often described to me the awful immorality of Winchester when he was at school there, and once said in a state of great excitement of a scene which he had witnessed there, 'If that isn't the nearest approach to hell of anything upon earth, I know not what is.' This censure of the moral danger, to which boys are exposed by being sent to public schools, was not softened, nor the rigour of it at all abated, as would have been the case with many men, by the remembrance of happy moments spent and of happy friendships formed there, nor by loyalty to the school itself; although it quite consisted with many jocose remembrances of his own inaptitude for the studies of the place, specially for Latin verse-making. He used to delight to recite some of the doggerel which he produced with the help of his 'Gradus,' when his form had a copy set to them on 'Daniel in the den of lions.' . . .

"I have often wished that it could have been contrived that Dean Hook and his life-long friend, Page Wood, who were both of them devoted Wintonians, could have met your father and said their say to him on the merits of the old school (for the estimate formed of it by two such men shows that it must have had merits), and received his reply. No doubt in some circles of our old public schools, as things were formerly, vice was rampant and shocking; but the size of these schools gave room for more than one circle, and boys were found in them (if I may judge by my own reminiscences of Eton) who recognised the claims of their higher nature, and acted as if they believed they had souls to be saved. It must, however, be confessed that this, though much to the credit of the boys, was but little to the credit of the schools; for the education given to boys of the upper classes in old times scarcely embraced any inculcation of religious truth, until Dr. Arnold (to his eternal honour be it said) inaugurated a new system, the influence of which has been felt in every public school in England. Winchester under Dr. Moberly must have been a wholly different thing from Winchester, when your father was at school there.

"But I must now speak of the deep religiousness of his character,—another feature of it in which I venture to think that he resembled the great statesman, to whom I have compared him above. I did not know him in his boyhood; but from what I

saw of him in later life I can hardly imagine that there ever was a time, when the religious instinct did not work powerfully in him. But we know that the religious instinct may and does work powerfully, even where the mind is not under the empire of religious principle. The religious instinct gives birth to religious sentiment; but religious principle has its seat in the will. I should say that religious principle was much more clearly manifested in your father after than before he adopted what used to be called Tractarian views, and became an avowed admirer and disciple of Mr. Newman. And I will mention an incident which seems to me to indicate this. In quite early days, when, though indeed he watched the Tractarian movement with keenest interest, he stood entirely aloof from this novel form of High Churchism, and felt disposed to be wholly suspicious and incredulous of it, I happened to meet him in the rooms of the present Dean of Durham. I forget the subject on which the conversation turned, but it was one to which it struck me that a passage in the Psalms applied. 'At all events David thought so,' said I; 'for he says so and so'—quoting the passage. Your father, who had advocated the view opposite to that which the Psalmist seemed to support, replied, 'But what of that? David, I daresay, was a great fool.' My acquaintance with your father at that time was quite recent; and not being in the habit of hearing the writers of Holy Scripture so spoken of, I was shocked, and showed by my manner that I was so. Immediately he apologised (though I was a younger man than he—indeed one of the attendants at his mathematical lecture), and explained that he did not for a moment mean to question David's moral and spiritual excellence, but only his intellectual power. 'Oh, don't mistake me; I am sure David was quite heavenly good; I only wish I were one hundreth part as good myself; but a man who is superlatively good may be of course superlatively foolish.'[1] I should not have thought of putting on record this incident were it not for the sequel, which to my mind shows the heightening of your father's religious tone when he embraced with heart and soul (he was incapable of doing anything by halves) the views known as Tractarian. Having asked me to walk with him one day, evidently with the view of telling me something he wished me to know, he adverted to his rashness and perverseness of speech on the occasion (three or four years ago) which I have referred to, and expressed the deepest penitence and humiliation for it. 'I am afraid,' he said, 'you must have been greatly shocked,

[1] "I must observe, by the way, that I believe he acquired the habit (so little in keeping with Holy Scripture itself) of discriminating between moral and intellectual excellence, as wholly distinct spheres, and having no connexion with one another, from Dr. Arnold, under whose influence he was brought at this period by Arthur Stanley, and other friends of his who had been at Rugby."

and with good reason, for nothing can excuse my having spoken in that way of a great Saint, who wrote under the inspiration of God.' These, I think, were as nearly as possible his words. May I add that I believe it was the deep religiousness of his mind which fenced off from him many spiritual dangers, to which a man of so speculative a turn of mind, so subtle in argument, so brilliant in dialectical skill, might else have succumbed? Apart from this he might perhaps have ranked with those opponents of Theism, whose arguments, taking them on their own philosophical ground, he has probably done more to demolish than any other single writer of the century. But at the very bottom of his heart and soul there lay this axiomatic truth of all religion, 'Verily there is a reward for the righteous: doubtless there is a God that judgeth the earth.'

"And now having exhibited the chief points of his character, as they struck my own mind, I will jot down a few reminiscences of him at the two periods of his life, at which alone I had any intercourse with him. These were the period when he was Fellow and Tutor of Balliol, and the much later period when he lived, at first close to my church, and afterwards in the Regent's Park, in London. Then I had the opportunity of meeting him again, and had many most friendly, though of course disputatious, conversations with him. Between these two periods I lost sight of him altogether, our lots being cast in quite different parts of the country.

"Shall I ever forget when I first heard his name, and heard it too associated with my own? My father had allowed me to come up from Eton to try my luck for a Balliol scholarship. The examination was over, and the boys, from various schools, were assembled in the College hall on the tiptoe of expectation to hear the announcement. At length there emerged from the common room into the hall good, cultivated little Mr. Oakeley, and the hubbub of eager youthful voices was hushed in a moment. All of us clustered like bees round Mr. Oakeley, some who could not get close enough to satisfy them clambering up on the benches to get a sight of one who was little of stature. After a generally complimentary exordium, probably *de rigueur* on these occasions, to the effect that, as all had done so well, the Master and Fellows wished they had as many fellowships and scholarships to give away as there were competitors, but as only two of each were vacant, they had been obliged to make a choice; that choice, he said, had fallen on Mr. Tait (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), and Mr. Ward for the fellowships, and on Mr. Lake (the present Dean of Durham) and myself for the scholarships. I have a sort of dim memory that shortly afterwards, when we had all streamed out of the hall, I saw (for the first time) your father in the quadrangle, friends gathering round him and warmly grasping his hand, and somebody told me, 'That is Mr. Ward.' Soon after, my

acquaintance with him was much improved by my being placed in his mathematical lecture. This was sure to be a first-rate lecture, the great clearness of his mind specially fitting him to be an expositor of pure Mathematics. He made us work problems, etc., under his own eye, and came round the room to each of us in turn to see how we were getting on. One day at an Algebra lecture he said to one of the men, who was working at an infinite series, and had just written out the three or four first steps of it, 'Yes, that is quite right; just finish writing it out.' Many other pupils in other parts of the room detained the tutor so long a time, that he did not revisit the man engaged on the infinite series for (say) twenty minutes, when he found that the pupil, under a misapprehension of his instructions, had not only completed the steps of the series, but had covered a sheet of foolscap paper with writing out the whole series over and over again, as if seeking an end of that which was interminable. The great zest of your father's amusement on this occasion, shown by the hearty ringing laugh which made every one look up from his work, was my first introduction to that hilarity and vivacity of mind upon which I have dwelt above, and of which I was afterwards to witness so many exhibitions. If my memory does not deceive me, Mr. Scott, afterwards Master of Balliol, and now Dean of Rochester, was elected to a fellowship in the year after your father and Mr. Tait, and these three together, besides being all of them unrivalled as tutors, each in his own department, —Mr. Tait in what we used to call our 'science' (meaning our Aristotle and Butler), your father in Mathematics, and Mr. Scott in Latin and Greek scholarship,—cordially concurred in endeavouring to promote the moral and religious welfare of all entrusted to their charge. They were all full of kindness and consideration for their pupils, and much esteemed and beloved, but I think your father was the most condescending of the three. I soon had no further need of his lectures, being advised by my physician not to read for mathematical as well as classical honours, but your father did not lose sight of me, and often asked me to breakfast and walk with him. I cannot say for certain (probably the Dean of Durham may be able to tell you) whether the influence which in those early days Dr. Arnold exerted over him continued after he was admitted to Holy Orders in the Church of England. Anyhow, it was very strong while it lasted. He paid visits to Dr. Arnold at Rugby, and collogued with him as to the progress of the Tract movement, of the tendencies of which at first your father, no less than the doctor, was very suspicious.

"I can tell you little or nothing about the process of his conversion to what were then known as Tractarian views; but I remember that this conversion worked in very harmoniously with the love which (as stated above) he had long previously cherished

for the services of the Breviary, and also generally for the æsthetic element in public worship. I should say that this love of the æsthetic in worship, of the abounding and beautiful symbolism, for example, which marks your services for the Holy Week, and specially for Good Friday, was the only symptom of poetical feeling which I could ever trace in his mind. I never heard him express enthusiasm about any poetry, unless indeed it were Shakespeare's plays, which, however, he seemed to appreciate more as pictures of human life than as poetry; but to religious symbolism—the dramatic exhibition, so to speak, of Divine Truth through the eye to the mind,—he was at all times keenly susceptible.

"I wish I could tell you something about his ordination as deacon and priest by the then Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Bagot) (he was ordained on his fellowship as a title), and about his state of mind in presenting himself for Holy Orders; but here again my paper must exhibit a blank. We undergraduates of Balliol became conscious of his having become a clergyman chiefly by his reading the prayers occasionally in the College chapel for the chaplain-fellow. And his was reading of the prayers such as one only hears once in a lifetime. I have myself never heard anything equal to it. Of course he had the great natural advantages of a magnificent ear and voice, which contributed not a little to the effect. But in addition to this, his reading of prayers had every merit which such reading should have; it was quiet, subdued, devout, wholly free not only from false but also from undue emphasis, neither too fast to follow (like college chapel reading, which is apt to degenerate into a gabble), nor too slow (as occasionally is the reading in parish churches), simple, and natural, and exempt from affectations of all kinds, and leaving the impression that the reader was deeply conscious that he was addressing Almighty God. I should add that in reading the Psalms, he was particularly careful to observe the colon in the Prayer-Book Version, which is a musical note for the choir, rather than a stop for the reader. Whether in doing this he had any design of indicating that properly the Psalms should be musically rendered I cannot say; but his method had the effect of bringing out beautifully the rhythm of that noble Version,—and there was something pleasing to the ear in the correspondence between the two clauses of each verse which was thus marked."

No account of Mr. Ward's "friendships" would be adequate which made no reference to two subjects, which can nevertheless be only briefly touched on here—I mean his friendship for the poor and his relations with some of the members of his own family. In both cases a side of his character was disclosed which was quite unknown to the world at large.

Of his tenderness for the poor it will be enough to say

that from the time when, in 1838, his religious views became deeper and more serious, he always put by every year a considerable portion of his income for purely charitable objects, and made personal care for the poor one of his duties. Mr. David Lewis tells me that he owed his acquaintance with Mr. Ward to their accidental meeting in a visit of charity. "I used to visit a sick person," he writes, "lodging in the parish of St. Mary, and frequently my visit coincided with his. I did not then know the reason [of his visits], and learned it after the funeral. She was an old servant in his family, and was then supported entirely by him, for she was destitute and friendless." Such acts of charity were common with him, and he often quoted with approval Dr. Arnold's saying that personal contact with the poor was one of the great safeguards against religious coldness and indifference.

In his own family circle—though it was part of his creed that one does not necessarily care for relatives as such, and his relations with his brothers and some of his sisters were entirely unsympathetic,—nevertheless the opportunity for intimate intercourse did on occasion lead to the deepest and tenderest friendships of his life. These friendships brought out peculiarly sympathetic traits which were hardly suspected by his college friends, who looked on him as the incarnation of intellectualism. Even apart from such instances it was sometimes noticed that his conversation was more suggestive and fresh among ladies who understood him, than in the constant warfare of discussion and repartee in which Oxford society abounded. He had a great contempt for the pedantry of intellectualism; and native wit, and native originality of mind, even when comparatively uneducated, always refreshed him. A woman's quick sympathy and ready tact had especial charms for him when he came across them, and he was impatient and even hurt at the supposition that his only delight was in purely intellectual conversation, with its technical phrases, divorced from the feelings and ideas of ordinary human life. "It is so kind," a cousin of his once remarked, after many walks and talks in his company, "of a clever man like you to give yourself the trouble of talking to a stupid woman like me." He checked her at once by his reply. "That is the first stupid thing," he answered, "that I ever heard you say."

Of his deeper influence in this connection—which extended to some who were not members of his own family—and of the traits in his character which it disclosed, I will allow two persons to speak who had experience of it, though their recollections belong to a somewhat later period. Mrs. Richard Ward, a daughter of his old friend and neighbour in the Isle of Wight, Sir John Simeon, writes as follows:—

"There are many who can speak far better and more fully than I can on the higher and graver side of Mr. Ward's character. What I should like to enlarge on is the exceeding loveableness of him. His sympathy was so tender, so unfailing, for the small as well as for the great troubles of life. A casual remark that one did not feel well, or that some trifling thing was a worry or a disappointment, would be met with, 'I am extremely sorry to hear you say that,' followed by really anxious questions which one felt were not asked for form's sake but came straight from his heart. In fact, I don't think he ever said or did anything for form's sake. He was absolutely unconventional, and would betray emotion, whether of joy or of grief, as few Englishmen do. Who can ever forget his rubbing his hands and his delighted chuckle over some story that amused him—very likely a story of or against himself, for he never minded turning the laugh against himself? His sense of humour was unbounded. It came bubbling out irrepressibly on all occasions great and small, and was probably one of his great helps in all the troubles, spiritual as well as temporal, of his life. . . .

"It was impossible to be shy or reserved with one who, by his *bonhomie*, his frank kindness, his childlike simplicity, put himself, so to speak, at the mercy of the most insignificant of those who approached him; though here I should like to mark a characteristic which might seem to militate against what I have just said, viz. the personal dignity which went along with his extraordinary condescension, which I think made it impossible for the most impudent person to take liberties with him.

"But with all his kindness he was ruthless in reproving wherever he believed that a point of faith was involved. I remember one day his stopping short in the road when I had made some rash statement, I do not know on what point. His whole look changed and with a solemnity of tone and manner which I can never forget he said, 'I think that any one holding that opinion is in a very dangerous and anxious state of mind.' . . .

"We, your father's friends, for whom the blank caused by his death can never be filled up, can only rejoice that he lived and that we had the privilege of having known him, for I do not think there was one he cared for or who cared for him who has not been the better and the stronger for his friendship."

The other extract I will quote is from a letter written by his eldest daughter—now for more than a quarter of a century a Dominican nun—which reveals an impression essential to the understanding of the character I am pourtraying, but which it would not be in place in a work like the present to illustrate in detail. The almost morbid sensitiveness to which it refers was doubtless allied to the intense melancholy of which I have already spoken; and neither revealed itself to the world at large. I have always thought that his indifference to the death of those whom he loved most was in truth a direct consequence of this keen and constant sensitiveness to all that was unhappy in his own life. This made life in general seem to him to be something which it were well to be out of.

"Of his tender affectionateness," his daughter writes, "and delicate sympathy and considerateness I need not speak. No one could have been more responsive or more intensely sensitive to any want of response on the part of others. If he did not feel deaths he was keenly alive to the least want of affection, and so amusingly, or rather touchingly, grateful for one's love, as though he had no claim upon it and was so surprised at getting it. There must have been a veritable depth of wounded feeling in his early life, for it always seemed as if there were open wounds in his heart that wanted continual soothing and anointing. . . . He told me that until his marriage he had felt a continual heart-bleeding from being unloved. . . . He said that he never suffered from that particular feeling after his marriage. Yet it was of him that uncle William Wingfield[1] said, 'You would not surely marry Ward! He is a hard-headed mathematician.'"

[1] William Wingfield, brother of the lady who afterwards became Mrs. Ward, was Ward's contemporary at Christ Church.

## CHAPTER VII

### A NEW CURRENT IN THE MOVEMENT

1838-41

MR. WARD openly avowed his adherence to Newman's party in the latter part of 1838. There was, about this time, a considerable accession to the ranks of the party of able men with directly Roman sympathies. It was indeed the beginning, as Cardinal Newman and others have told us, of a new school of thought—of a movement within the Movement. The various gradations of opinion which had successively dominated the original party were becoming effete. Mr. Palmer and Dr. Hook had long disapproved of the Tracts. The Tracts themselves were within measurable distance of dissolution. Dr. Pusey had been left behind by the editors of Froude, who roundly condemned the English reformers. Newman's own explanation of the *via media* became, a few months later, doubtful in the eyes of its originator. In this state of things Mr. Ward's party commenced its action with a new and startling programme—scarcely avowed at first, but containing germs which developed a little later with rapidity, as the new party gained in influence and numbers. Rome was directly looked on by them as in many respects the practical model; the Reformation was a deadly sin; restoration to the papal communion the ideal—even if unattainable—aim. "Your father was never a High Churchman," Cardinal Newman writes to me, "never a Tractarian, never a Puseyite, never a Newmanite. What his line was is described in the *Apologia*, pp. 163 *seq.*" And he writes in the passage here referred to, "A new school of thought was rising, as is usual in doctrinal

inquiries, and was sweeping the original party of the movement aside and was taking its place." It consisted of "eager, acute, resolute minds," who "had heard much of Rome," who "cut into the original movement at an angle and then set about turning it" in a new direction.

Among the most prominent members of this new school may be mentioned Oakeley, Faber, Dalgairns, John Brande Morris, James Antony Froude, and Charles Seager. Of Oakeley I have already spoken, and of the strange history of J. A. Froude I shall have something to say later on. Oakeley brought to the Movement the gifts of "elegant genius, of classical mind, of rare talent in literary composition," as the author of the *Apologia* has told us; an earnestness, simplicity, and piety rarely matched, and the weight of high University standing and of his influence as incumbent of the well-known church in Margaret Street.

The gifts and characteristics of the others whom I have named have been described to me by their distinguished contemporary the Dean of St. Paul's. Seager and Morris were "men of wide and abstruse learning, quaint, eccentric scholars both in habit and in look, students of the ancient type who even fifty years ago seemed out of date to their generation, . . . men who had worked their way to knowledge through hardship and grinding labour, and in one case under the pinch of poverty, which had imposed on him for a time the life and task-work of an usher in a small school; men not to be outdone in Germany itself for devouring love of learning and a scholar's plainness of life. Mr. Morris had in him, besides, a real, though often grotesque vein of poetical imagination; Mr. Seager's poetry was signalised only, so far as we know, in a Hebrew ode at the installation of the Duke of Wellington. But he died not long ago at Florence with a continental reputation as an Oriental scholar."

Faber "was a man with a high gift of imagination, remarkable powers of assimilating knowledge, and a great richness and novelty and elegance of thought, which, with much melody of expression, made him ultimately a very attractive preacher. If," the writer adds, "the promise of his powers has not been adequately fulfilled it is partly to be traced to a want of severity of taste and self-restraint which made him too content

with fluency and sweetness; but his name will live in some of his hymns and in some very beautiful portions of his devotional writings." Some may think that his failure to realise the hopes of the intellectual world as to the future career of the author of *Sir Lancelot*, may be traced in part to other sources, but for which Catholic London would never have witnessed the great work of the Oratory, and the name of Faber would not stand, as it does, high in the list of devotional writers and spiritual directors.

"Dalgairns's mind was of a different order. 'That man has an eye for theology,' was the remark of a competent judge on some early paper of Dalgairns's which came before him. He had something of the Frenchman about him. There was in him in his Oxford days a bright and frank briskness, a mixture of modesty and arch daring, which gave him an almost boyish appearance; but beneath this boyish appearance there was a subtle and powerful intellect, keenly alive to all the problems of religious philosophy, and impatient of any but the most thorough solutions of them; while, on the other hand, the religious affections were part of his nature, and mind and will and heart yielded an unreserved and absolute obedience to the leading and guidance of faith. In his later days, with his mind at ease, Father Dalgairns threw the whole strength of his powerful intelligence into the great battle with unbelief, and few men have commanded more the respect of opponents not much given to think well of the arguments for religion, by the freshness, the breadth, and the solidity of his reasoning."

This group of men started from a point of departure differing entirely from that of the original leaders—Newman, Pusey, and Keble. With these leaders, as we have seen, the ancient English Church had been the first thought. Anglicanism was in their eyes the lineal descendant of the Church of Augustine. Such was the claim of the divines of the seventeenth century whose *via media* they professed to follow. The study of the Fathers and of the early English saints had, it is true, led to opinions which were said to tend Romewards. But such views were a conclusion; they were not the original premises. The Roman tendency, so far as it existed, was for the most part against their inclination, for they disliked and distrusted Rome.

To understand how the tendency first came to exist we must consider briefly the history of the Tracts. In the first stages of the Movement they consisted of short addresses on fly leaves—to which the name Tract was suitably applied. I have already referred to the circumstances which brought them into existence. They were designed to strengthen the Anglican Church against the inroads of Popery and of Methodism. The conception of the Church of England as a branch of the Church Catholic—with the correlative elements of Catholic doctrine essential to this conception—seemed to be absolutely dying out, while even Protestantism was not in earnest within the State Church as it was among the dissenters. This loss of life and of vital religion threatened to separate religious minds altogether from its pale. The Church was becoming a mere function of the State, and Erastianism was triumphing all along the line. "A great proportion of the Irish sees," wrote the editor, "had been suppressed by the State against the Church's wish," and "scarcely a protesting voice was heard." "A sense of the dreariness of such a state of things," he continues, "naturally led to those anxious appeals and abrupt sketches of doctrine, with which the Tracts opened. They were written with the hope of rousing members of our Church to comprehend her alarming position . . . as a man might give notice of a fire or inundation to startle all who heard him,—with only as much of doctrine and argument as might be necessary to account for their publication, or might answer more obvious objections to the views therein advocated."

Preserving at first the safe ground of a return to the Anglicanism of Laud and of the seventeenth century divines, they maintained, for the most part, that the existing English Church was "more Protestant than its Reformers" of the sixteenth century,[1] and that a second Reformation was needed to undo the work of the last 150 years. The wise moderation of the Reformers was insisted on; their preservation in the Church liturgy of the doctrines of apostolical succession, the Holy Catholic Church, the sacramental character of orders; their equally wise insistence, in the practical life of Anglicanism, upon a *via media* between the formalism of Popery and the total overthrow by the foreign

[1] Tract 41, p. 6.

reformers of traditional Catholicism. Thus, for example, the total abolition of fasting in the Protestant Churches is censured in Tract 18, and "the calm judgment of the reformers of our prayer-books" is eulogised in that while "cutting off the abuses which before prevailed, the vain distinctions of meats, the luxurious abstinences, the lucrative dispensations," they still prescribed fasting. "They left it," says the writer, "to every man's Christian prudence and experience *how* he would fast; but they prescribed the days on which he should fast, both in order to obtain an unity of feeling and devotion in the members of Christ's body, and to preclude the temptation to the neglect of the duty altogether."[1] And so, too, it was with such practices as daily celebrations—the superstitions of the mass being abolished, but the daily service and commemoration of the saints preserved, or with devotion to the "real presence" —the subtleties of Transubstantiation being rejected, but the essence of the doctrine and devotion preserved.

These doctrines were rendered persuasive by the eloquence of Newman from the pulpit, and by their expression in the language of the poet of the Movement—the author of *The Christian Year*. The Tractarian theology of the "real presence," for example, is nowhere more simply and beautifully given than in the lines:—

> "O come to our Communion Feast.
> There present in the heart,
> Not in the hands—the eternal Priest
> Will his true self impart."[2]

The Tracts themselves were but the heralds, in the first instance, of the doctrines—popular sketches, sometimes thrown into the form of tales, or of short dialogues.

Gradually the party gained adherents. Catholic doctrines and Catholic practices were adopted, and not merely advocated as a philosophical or literary theory. Rigorous fasting,—not Vincent's fast from Portugal onions, described in Newman's *Loss and Gain*, but fasting in true Cistercian form,—auricular confession, and other elements in the Catholic rule of life, were evidences that the party practised what they preached, and

[1] Tract 18, p. 7.

[2] So ran the lines in early editions. I shall have something to say elsewhere of their subsequent alteration.

the importance of the Movement grew. It was attacked at length by its enemies, and the character of the Tracts changed after some fifty had been published. They became sustained argumentative treatises, and promised to form a deeper and fuller body of Anglican theology, based on the lines laid down by the theologians of the seventeenth century. Controversy drove the party back on the grounds of their belief. Their Catholicism was denied to be genuine, and they were led to trace its descent through the divines of the *via media* from the early Fathers. The genuineness of the descent had to be made good against rival claimants, and so the Roman question came to the front. Then in 1836 the English translations of the Fathers began to appear, and the patristic element in the theology of the school became still more prominent. Newman has told us that the Fathers led him from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, and this being so it was inevitable that the patristic tendency in the Tracts should colour their tone as it coloured the opinions of the editor, and should pave the way for the altered attitude towards Rome, and towards the English Reformers which Froude's *Remains* first made publicly manifest.

With Mr. Ward the progress of thought and the original premises were, as we have already seen, very different from all this. Tractarianism did not supply him with reluctant conclusions in favour of Rome; on the contrary, it stopped short his conclusions and kept him an Anglican. He had no distinctive affection for the Anglican Church. He disliked it in the present; and he knew nothing of its past. The study of primitive times was uncongenial to his unhistorical mind. Nor had he any acquaintance with the divines of the seventeenth century—Bull, Hooker, Laud, Andrewes, and the rest. The existing Roman Church was the avowed object of his admiration. He was driven, by the inconsistency of Anglicanism, and the sceptical tendency of private judgment, to admire the most thorough and consistent scheme attainable of authoritative teaching. While Newman passed from the study of antiquity to the conception of a united Universal Church, and from that conception to a reluctant doubt of the lawfulness of separation from Rome, Ward, by exactly an opposite process passed from admiration for the Roman Church

to the conception of the necessity of union with the Church Universal, and hence to a doubt, suggested by the fact that the Anglican Church had once enjoyed such communion, as to whether it might not still have it potentially. The link in the past which drove Newman towards Rome in spite of his love of England, kept Mr. Ward in the English Church in spite of the attractions of Rome. The Tractarian teaching, at the stage it had reached, called attention to this link—to the common parentage of the two churches—and consequently it held Ward back and for a time secured his allegiance. "I believe," wrote his brother Fellow Mr. Scott, ". . . that if Ward is in reality what we may call a Romanist filtered, the filtration and not the Romanism is what he owes to Newman . . . that [he has] not been brought by the Tracts to the state of mind you speak of, but on the contrary arrested by them just at the point, perhaps too near it, when [he was] actually falling into Romanism."[1] And Ward himself speaks in no doubtful terms of union with Rome as the ideal vision which inspired him. "Restoration of active communion with the Roman Church," he writes to a friend in 1841, "is the most enchanting earthly prospect on which my imagination can dwell." His remarks too on Froude's book—in a letter written in the same year to Dr. Pusey—indicate the same line of sympathies. "The especial charm in it to me," he wrote, "was . . . his hatred of our present system and of the Reformers, and his sympathy with the rest of Christendom."

The love of Rome and of an united Christendom which marked the new school was not purely a love for ecclesiastical authority. This was indeed one element; but there was another yet more influential in many minds,—admiration for the saints of the Roman Church, and for the saintly ideal as realised especially in the monastic life. We have already seen how this element operated in Mr. Ward's own history. Froude had struck the note of sanctity as well as the note of authority. He had raised an inspiring ideal on both heads; and behold, with however much of practical corruption and superstition mixed up with their practical exhibitions, these ideals were actually reverenced, attempted, often realised, in the existing Roman Church. The worthies of the English Church—even

[1] In a letter to Mr. Tait, then Fellow of Balliol.

when sharing the tender piety of George Herbert or Bishop Ken —fell short of the heroic aims, the martial sanctity, gained by warfare unceasing against world, flesh, and devil, which they found exhibited in Roman Hagiology. The glorying in the Cross of Christ, which is the keynote to such lives as those of St. Ignatius of Loyola and St. Francis Xavier, while it recalled much in the life of St. Paul, had no counterpart in post-Reformation Anglicanism.[1]

The state of things which made this directly Romeward movement tolerable to any considerable section of the English Church was, however, sufficiently remarkable. The Anglicanism of the party must have receded very considerably from the views of the early Tracts before such a thing could be possible. Perhaps two events were especially instrumental to such a preparation: the first was the language used with respect to the English Reformers by Newman and Keble, in the Preface to the second part of Froude's *Remains* early in 1839. However guarded and measured the expressions were, such language expressed a definite view with far-reaching consequences; and the extraordinary weight attaching to Newman's lightest utterance gave the words additional significance. "The editors," one passage ran, "by publishing [Mr. Froude's] sentiments . . . so unreservedly . . . indicated their own general acquiescence in the opinion that the persons chiefly instrumental in [the Reformation] were not as a party to be trusted on ecclesiastical and theological questions, nor yet to be imitated in their practical handling of the unspeakably awful matters with which they were concerned." Again, the differences between the Reformers and the Fathers, both in doctrine and in moral sentiment, were insisted on by the editors. "You must choose between the two lines," they wrote; "they are not only diverging but contrary." And certain questions as to the practical Christian ideal are specified as instances: "Compare the sayings and manner of the two schools on the subjects of fasting, celibacy, religious vows, voluntary retirement and contemplation, the memory of the saints, rites and

[1] This general account of the attitude and spirit of the new school is derived, in substance, from private notes of the Dean of St. Paul's, to which he has kindly given me access. It is corroborated by the writings of Ward, Dalgairns, Oakeley, and others, a few years later in the *British Critic*.

ceremonies recommended by antiquity."[1] The conclusion which, though unspoken here, was undeniable once it was suggested—the conclusion "in these matters Rome has preserved what England has lost—in these matters we may take Rome for our model if we would return to antiquity," could not but gain a footing in the minds of Newman's disciples.

The second event to which I have referred was more important in its consequences, though less immediately obvious. Cardinal Newman refers to it in the *Apologia*. "[The Roman party commenced to act in force] as it so happened," he writes, "contemporaneously with that very summer (1839) in which I received so serious a blow to my ecclesiastical views from the study of the Monophysite controversy." It had come upon him that the Monophysites of the Early Church were in the same position as the Anglicans of to-day, and yet the Early Church regarded them as heretics. The fundamental view of the *via media*, the defence of Anglicanism against the charge of schism by the appeal to antiquity, was shaken. St. Augustine's words with reference to the Donatists, "securus judicat orbis Terrarum," struck him with a new force and significance; "they decided ecclesiastical questions by a simpler rule than that of antiquity; nay, St. Augustine was one of the prime oracles of antiquity; here then was antiquity deciding against itself." Cardinal Newman tells us that for a moment the thought came, "the Church of Rome will be found right after all." He mentioned the doubt at the time to only two persons. One of them—Mr. Henry Wilberforce—has described his first intimation of it.[2] The awful shock which the bare thought gave to his followers at the time is apparent in Mr. Wilberforce's account. He states that Newman referred to the new view suggested by St. Augustine's words while walking one day with him in the New Forest. He said that a "*vista* had been opened before him the end of which he did not see." He spoke of the possibility of joining the Roman Church, and Wilberforce, "upon whom such a fear came like a thunderstroke, expressed his hope that Mr. Newman might die rather than take such a step." In the course of the conversation he debated whether if a hundred of the party saw their way to it,

[1] See *Froude's Remains*, vol. iii. pp. 19, 28.
[2] *Dublin Review*, April 1869, p. 327.

it might not be their duty to join. Mr. Wilberforce does not vouch for his accuracy as to the exact words used, but he adds, "the deep wound which they branded in the inmost soul of the hearer makes it quite impossible that they should not be correct in substance."

The doubt which had touched Newman was, it is true, not generally known; but he could no longer speak with the same clearness and confidence as before, as to the validity of the Anglican position. Such a thought once admitted would at moments recur, and men whose whole sympathy was with Rome were quick to detect the least symptom of uncertainty. He felt, as Mr. Wilberforce tells us, the necessity of giving an answer to the interpretation of St. Augustine's saying on which Wiseman had recently insisted in the *Dublin Review*. He saw the danger of secessions. "I shall have . . . such men as Ward of Balliol going over to Rome,"[1] he said. He met the difficulty as best he could, and satisfied himself that it was not fatal. But things were no longer as before. "He never settled down exactly into his old position," writes Mr. Wilberforce. "Before August 1839 he had always both spoken and written of the Roman Church in the strong language of condemnation which he had learnt from the great Anglican writers, of whom it must be said that however Catholic on any other subject, the very mention of the Pope acted as a chemical test to precipitate in a moment their latent Protestantism. He no longer maintained the *via media*, or attacked Rome as schismatical. His new position was that 'Rome is the Church, and we are the Church,' and 'there is no need to inquire which of the two has deflected most from the Apostolic standard.' This is the view he puts forward in the article on 'The Catholicity of the English Church,' which appeared in January 1840, and was the first result of his restored tranquillity of mind."

It is plain that this position on the part of the great leader left Ward a comparatively free hand. If Rome had kept much which England had lost, there could be no insuperable objection to learning, so far, from directly Roman sources. Each Church had lost what the other had kept, and so within limits each could learn from the other. Ward soon commenced the study and propagation of Roman books and manuals of

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 328.

dogmatics, casuistry, and ascetics. The ascetic works were most of all defensible, as it was in this department that confessedly England failed and Rome succeeded. The high ideal of the interior life, which had been his chief attraction to Newmanism and to Catholicism, was fully sustained in its mediæval and modern devotional literature; and while many others betook themselves by preference to the beautiful but more indefinite lessons of the early Fathers, he preferred their systematic application to the needs of daily life by later writers, and above all by St. Ignatius and the Jesuits. Both in ascetics and in dogmatics the Jesuits were his favourite reading. The spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius with their immediately practical character, their provisions at every turn for testing the reality of spiritual advance, their minute precepts as to the best method of training the will, of uprooting particular faults, of making the unseen world real by practical meditation, of keeping a consistent view of life, and bearing in mind in every action its true supernatural aim and end,—these were adapted with wonderful accuracy to his own special character and needs.

Then, again, the accurate classification of the various parts of theological science to be found in the Scholastics, and yet more perfectly in the later Jesuits, Suarez, Vasquez, Ripalda, was more congenial to him than the informal character of the Patristic theology. He admired the system of logical proof, categorical statement of objection and answer, careful assignment of the sources of theological truth and of the proportion each bears to the whole body. He loved to have his views mapped out before his mind, with each connecting link between first principle and ultimate conclusion neatly and systematically expressed, and this taste was satisfied to the full by the scholastic method. His contemporaries remember, and some of his letters confirm their testimony, that he literally buried himself in the works of Aquinas and Buonaventure, and of the great Spanish theologians of the sixteenth century, and laid the foundations at this time of the deep and wide theological learning which he attained to later.

His sympathy, too, with Roman habits of outward devotion increased. At Margaret Street, whither he constantly repaired to help his friend Oakeley, the Saints' Days were kept, and the regular cycle of seasons—feasts and fasts—elaborately observed

for those who cared to profit by them. But in all this the ascetic and devotional purposes were the first thought, and neither he nor Oakeley had any sympathy with the modern interest in the details of ritual for their own sake. In Mr. Ward's view the ceremonial of the Church was a grand antidote against the constant sceptical imaginings to which he was a prey. At times when the spiritual world seemed totally unreal, when the difficulties against faith with which, as we have seen, the material creation abounded in his eyes, tried him most, it helped his imagination to look at the outward symbols of great religious mysteries. The doubts were to a great extent imaginative rather than intellectual, and a remedy was required appealing primarily to the imagination. Such tokens of a visible Church supplied this need. "An invisible Church," he wrote, "would be a very sorry antagonist against so very visible a world."

And, again, he looked upon ritual and ceremonial in this respect as supplementary to the beauties of nature in suggesting the existence and beauty of the Creator and of the next world. Conscience gives the first intimation of the spiritual world; the Church completes and defines it. Natural beauty gives the first suggestions of the beauty of God, aiding one to realise belief in Him, and the ceremonial and liturgical rites of the Church complete this office with respect to the whole world of faith. "The natural man," he wrote, "receives peculiar and invaluable religious impressions from objects of external beauty, and so does the Christian; but as, on the one hand, his more highly endowed nature is able to apprehend ideas of a still higher and more mysterious character, so, on the other hand, he is not left to accidental human agency; the vast ceremonial, ritual, liturgical system which is the Church's heritage, the noble building, the solemn procession, the ravishing chant are to an indefinite extent the suggestions of the Spirit Himself to the Bride of Christ." [1]

The growing popularity of Roman literature and avowed admiration for Roman liturgy naturally aroused the suspicions of the heads of the University and the bishops with respect to the whole Movement. As early as 1839 there were symptoms of uneasiness. Cardinal Newman gives an account of them in

[1] See *British Critic*, No. LXVII. Art. I.

the *Apologia*. The Bishop of Oxford in his charge referred to the Tracts in terms which showed whither the current of feeling was tending. Heads of houses dissuaded men from attending Newman's sermons. One Vice-Chancellor preached against the doctrine of the Tracts, another threatened to take his children away from St. Mary's, and it was said that vice-chancellors could not be got to take the office on account of Puseyism. Elements were thus discernible of the storm which burst in 1841 on the publication of Tract 90. There can be little doubt that such opposition fanned the flame of the Catholic Movement instead of hindering it. The Heads were—with the exception of Dr. Routh of Magdalen—men of little or no learning, and of incurable narrowness of view. And, again, the division, at that time so absolute, between senior and junior members of the University, helped and fostered misunderstanding. The University Authorities failed to understand either the depth and strength of the forces impelling the Movement, or the latitude on the Catholic side, which must of necessity be tolerated if the history of the English Church, and of the Catholic party from the first included in it, were impartially reviewed. The Roman tendency was in their eyes mere sentimentalism—a hankering after pompous ceremonial, or a taste for image worship. They had no notion either of the deep philosophical basis of Catholicism which influenced the more intellectual, or of the conception of religious heroism, expressed in the lives of the saints and in the monastic life, which had a deep hold, likewise, on less intellectual but equally earnest members of the party. That such men should see in Rome actually realised an ideal of sanctity to which the English Church was a stranger, never occurred to them; and consequently they never seriously considered whether that ideal should not, for the sake of all parties, be tolerated in the Established Church. They looked on admiration for Rome as a perverse whim, with no deep foundation, and treated the party which was guilty of it rather as a set of refractory schoolboys than as serious men. These misunderstandings[1] urged the Movement

[1] That this was the view taken of the attitude of the heads of houses by the great bulk of the Tractarian party is sufficiently notorious. Its details I have procured partly from conversations in the past with my father, and partly from information with which the Dean of St. Paul's has kindly provided me.

forward. On the one hand, its opponents were despising and making little of what was felt to be deep and earnest; on the other, they were showing narrowness and ignorance which accentuated dissatisfaction with existing authority. Had these persecuting elements been absent it is possible that the crisis which came in 1845 might have been at all events postponed. But the attitude of those in authority tended all along to drive the party to the conclusion that the Anglican Church was not the place for them;—that they could not reasonably claim as their mother a Church which refused to acknowledge them.

This state of things was beginning when Mr. Ward joined the party of the Movement. Dr. Faussett's bitter attack on the editors of Froude's *Remains* in 1838 was, perhaps, the first signal for war—a desultory war of intermittent skirmishing until the beginning of 1841, and from that time onwards relentless and constant.

From the first Ward's influence on the party of his adoption seems to have been marked. The state of the University, to which this was in part due, is referred to by Professor Jowett in his *Recollections*, and the general characteristics of his early influence are graphically sketched in a few sentences by the Dean of St. Paul's.

"To understand the great influence which, during a few years, your father exercised at Oxford," writes Professor Jowett, "it is necessary to appreciate the state of the University. He came upon a time when the senior members, with the exception of Routh, the President of Magdalen, who belonged to the previous generation, and was to us a *nominis umbra*, were comparatively undistinguished. Whately and Copleston had been translated to another sphere; Blanco White, the celebrated convert from Catholicism, had ceased to reside; Hampden, the Regius Professor of Divinity, had little influence. It was an age of young men. J. H. Newman was only about thirty-seven years old, Pusey a year older, your father ten years younger."

"[Ward] brought to his new side," writes the Dean of St. Paul's, "a fresh power of controversial writing; but his chief influence was a social one: from his bright and attractive conversation, his bold and startling candour, his frank, not to say reckless, fearlessness of consequences, his unrivalled skill in logical fence, his unfailing good humour and love of fun, in which his personal clumsiness set off the vivacity and nimbleness of his joyous moods. 'He was,' says Mr. Mozley, 'a great musical critic, knew all the operas, and was

an admirable buffo singer.' No one could doubt that having started he would go far, and probably go fast. Mr. Ward was well known in Oxford, and his language might have warned the Heads that if there was a drift towards Rome it came from something much more serious than a hankering after a sentimental ritual, or for mediæval legends instead of the Bible."

In spite, however, of his Roman sympathies and tendencies Ward, for the first three years at least of his membership of the Tractarian party, had no thought of any change of communion. He says expressly in a letter to Dr. Pusey, dated July 1841, that the idea has never come before him as a practical one. He accepted readily Newman's conception of the corruption of the Roman popular system, and while contending that Rome had preserved to a great extent the true ideal of a Church which England had lost, and while attracted to the ascetical, theological, and liturgical aspects of the Roman Church, and generally to her formal and obligatory teaching (as he viewed it), he considered that there must be plainer indications than he could see in the anomalous state of Christendom to warrant a change of communion. He followed Mr. Newman in the view that "the English Church was on her trial." If she could recover her Catholic character, if the Movement continued to progress and to grow, the ultimate result would be reunion with the Roman Church; and it seemed wrong by any hasty step on the part of individuals to frustrate so glorious a prospect. Besides he did at first consider that Rome herself must in some respects change and meet the Anglo-Catholics half-way, though this idea, which he had taken in along with the rest of Mr. Newman's teaching, rapidly disappeared, as we shall see, after the year 1841.

One obstacle, however, had to be overcome against the tenableness of the position. Mr. Ward's acquaintance with Roman theology pressed home to him the fact that by no possibility could the Roman Church ever acquiesce in a scheme of reunion which involved the surrender of any of her formal decrees. The articles of reunion in the future must include the decrees of Trent. Popular teaching might be disowned, devotional practices modified to suit a particular national character—nay, much of the actual liturgy of the English Church could imaginably be preserved untouched, for similar

allowances were made by Rome in the case of the Greeks and Armenians; but formal decrees of the Church must stand for ever, or she would stultify herself and give the lie to her own history. If there was anything in the constitution and obligatory formularies of the English Church inconsistent with the decrees of Trent, Mr. Ward's position was a false one, and he could not retain it.

The question of subscription to the Articles he considered —he had perforce to consider it—on his ordination. When ordained deacon he subscribed them, as we have seen, in Dr. Arnold's sense, and he tells us[1] that even then one of his brother fellows had a scruple in signing his testimonials. This led him to look into the matter closely, and the conclusion he arrived at was that the Articles offered no greater difficulty to the Liberals than other formularies to other schools of thought tolerated within the Church. When signing them in Newman's sense on his final ordination he found the difficulty greater, but still persevered in the conclusion that as no one could subscribe the Church formularies, as a whole, according to their *ethos*— for the prayer-book represented Catholic, the Articles for the most part Protestant views—all must be content to subscribe the letter of them honestly, evading here and there the spirit. Still the liberty of interpretation must have its limits, and the explicit recognition of the doctrines of Trent had not hitherto been contemplated. Could it be consistent with the Anglo-Catholic position to admit the compatibility of these doctrines with the Articles? Considering the marked line which the old-fashioned Tractarians had ever drawn between Catholicism and Romanism, considering, too, that a large and influential section among them still regarded the Reformation as a heaven-sent deliverance from the Roman overgrowths of Catholic doctrine, and that Trent was by many taken to be the embodiment of these overgrowths, it seemed very doubtful how far such a view would be tolerated.

Nothing short of this view, however, would satisfy Mr. Ward's position, and he quickly detected in Newman's attitude sufficient hesitation on the subject to give him hopes. His position with respect to the Reformers and his position with respect to the Church of Rome were radically different from

[1] See p. 179.

Dr. Pusey's, and Mr. Ward's object was to point out and accentuate that difference. "He was the first," writes Mr. Lewis, then fellow of Jesus College, "to publish the existence of a fundamental difference between Cardinal Newman and Dr. Pusey. He was on the side of the former, as indeed were many others who did not like to recognise that difference, and avoided the mention of it. Some were angry with Mr. Ward for making public that difference, but Mr. Ward was not moved by that. It was never his habit to conceal anything of this kind, and we were always rallying him upon his candour."

In the Preface to the second part of Froude's *Remains* Newman and Keble had spoken of "the right and duty of taking (the Anglican) formularies as we find them, and interpreting them, as, God be thanked, they may be always interpreted in all essentials, conformably to the doctrine and ritual of the Church Universal." Ward held that the principle here implied might be made to cover the view he maintained. The Council of Trent did not necessarily embody Roman popular teaching with all its corruptions: the Articles might include a protest against such teaching, and yet in being consistent with the teaching of the Universal Church, they might be consistent with that portion of the teaching of the Church of Rome to which Trent had irrevocably committed her.

Ward was already acquainted with Newman, and their acquaintance gradually became a friendship. "Lord Blachford as much as any one," writes the Cardinal, "made me intimate with him." In the latter part of 1840 he was, the Cardinal tells me, almost daily in his rooms at Oriel discussing the prospects and programme of the Movement. Newman appears to have seen that with Ward and with others it was gradually becoming a choice between explicit recognition of this very elastic view of the Articles, and actual secession to Rome. So at least he plainly intimates in his letter to Dr. Jelf, published in 1841. This was the state of things which led him to write the celebrated Tract 90. "Ward worried him into writing Tract 90," Archbishop Tait somewhat angrily expresses it;[1] and the

[1] In a diary, the use of which I owe to the kindness of his biographer, the Rev. W. Benham.

Tract though not ostensibly advocating Ward's views to the full — for this would have hastened a final division of the Tractarians into two camps, and would have given the extreme party the open support of the great leader,—was yet claimed as distinctly tolerating them. It pointed out that the Articles were drawn up before the Council of Trent, and therefore could not have been aimed at its decrees; and that Trent condemned some of the excesses condemned by the Articles. In his defence of the Tract Newman said that he had referred to these points for the sake of others, and he spoke of Pusey's favourable view of the Reformers, declaring that "the question" was in his opinion "quite an open one." In spite, however, of this olive branch held out to the old party of the Movement, the Tract was hailed by Ward as a victory for himself and his friends.[1] It was the most directly Romeward movement of the leader; and however qualified and reserved in its mode of expression, it contemplated without disapproval all that the extreme party contended for.

I must, however, reserve for a subsequent chapter an account of the Tract, and of the storm succeeding its publication, as this was the commencement of a fresh state of things in Oxford.

There was another phase of the Movement—in the year preceding the appearance of the Tract—with which Ward was accidentally thrown in contact, though his relations with it were never deeply sympathetic. The revival of interest in ancient ritual and architecture, that æsthetic Catholicism which foreshadowed the modern Ritualism, though it formed no prominent part of the teaching of the leaders, was attractive to another class of mind. Dr. Bloxam of Upper Beeding Priory, then Fellow of Magdalene and a close friend of Dr. Routh, was the centre of this Movement. He was not a man of speculative tastes, but was a learned antiquarian and a most genial friend. Ward was on terms of hearty good fellowship with him, and made through him his earliest acquaintance with English "Roman" Catholics. Bloxam has been called the "father of Ritualism," and his Catholicism was entirely of a different cast from Ward's. The contrast was perhaps the more marked from Ward's entire repudiation—in his customary manner—of all knowledge of

[1] See letter to Dean Scott in the next chapter, p. 167.

any detail of Gothic architecture, primitive rites, or ancient vestments. When Pugin, the great Catholic architect, came up in 1840 to stay with Bloxam, he was full of a project for new Gothic buildings for Balliol College. Bloxam introduced him to Ward, taking him to his rooms at Balliol. Pugin, with his love of mediævalism, saw with satisfaction on Ward's table the *Summa* of St. Thomas and the works of St. Buonaventure, in huge folio volumes; and their student's enthusiasm for the Church of the Middle Ages struck a chord of common sympathy. To Pugin this signified the existence of that devotion to Gothic architecture which was in his eyes a necessary corollary following from the true Catholic spirit. They soon became friends, and the visit was returned and repeated. After a talk with Ward one day Pugin went to see Bloxam, and said to him, "What an extraordinary thing that so glorious a man as Ward should be living in a room without mullions to the windows." Next time they met Pugin taxed him with this deficiency, and received a rude shock from Ward's reply: "What are mullions? I never heard of them." Pugin was, however, incredulous, but on receiving a second assurance: "I haven't the most distant idea what they are like," he retired discomfited. A few fresh tokens of "invincible ignorance" in architecture so shocked Pugin, that he entirely refused to believe that Ward meant what he said. "I see how it is, my dear sir," he said, "you conceal your graces."

As time went on, however, the painful truth forced itself on Pugin's mind, not only in the case of Ward, but in that of others of whom he had entertained high hopes. Newman and Faber, after their conversion, both deserted Gothic for the Italian architecture of the Renaissance and modern Rome. "Very sad, my dear sir," he said to a friend, "they have fallen from grace." Dr. Bloxam tells me that he believes this disappointment of his confident hopes of assistance from the Oxford School in the Gothic revival, contributed materially to the illness to which Pugin eventually succumbed. In 1846 he built Ward a house near Old Hall College (of which he designed the chapel with its beautiful screen), and gradually during their necessary intercourse in this connection, he came at last to realise the terrible deficiencies of his client. Comfort was preferred to beauty of form; lancet windows were tabooed;

plenty of light and plenty of air were insisted on at the cost of any degree of infringement of the rules of art. Pugin became depressed and then angry. In a letter to the president of Old Hall College, written about 1848, he speaks as follows: "I assure you if I had known Mr. Ward would have turned out so badly, I would never have designed a respectable house for him. He ought not to be allowed to reside in the vicinity of so fine a screen. I would assign him a first floor opposite Warwick Street Chapel. Who could have thought that the glorious man whom I knew at Oxford could have fallen so miserably low? it is very sad." And writing to Dr. Bloxam on these matters, he adds one line as a postscript, "Ward heads the anti-screen men. Sad, sad, sad."

Pugin's curious possession by one idea only grew as time went on, and became even more fantastic in its exhibitions. Within the next year he wrote, when accepting an invitation to stay with a friend, expressing himself as unable to eat puddings unless they were Gothic in form, and enclosing a design for a Gothic pudding. The last eccentricity which he exhibited in his connection with Mr. Ward was on occasion of a letter sent by the latter to a Catholic magazine on the subject of rood screens, attacking them as undevotional. Not wishing to stab Pugin in the dark he wrote to him acknowledging the authorship, and received a reply to the following effect: "Sir, it needed not your note to convince me that you were the perpetrator of the scandalous letter. I can only say that the less we have to do with each other in future the better, for I must plainly tell you that I consider you a greater enemy to true Christianity than the most rabid Exeter Hall fanatic." Mr. Ward, on finishing the letter remarked, "I knew Pugin was strong in rood screens; I didn't know he was so good a hand at rude letters."

## CHAPTER VIII

### TRACT NO. 90

ON the appearance of the celebrated Tract 90, early in 1841, the growing feeling of suspicion and distrust of the Movement on the part of the authorities of the Church and University took shape, and a storm burst over the heads of the party. Newman himself was far from looking for the violence of feeling it aroused, though Ward, anxious as he was for its publication, had maintained that nothing less was to be expected. "It is a fact," writes Mr. Oakeley in his recollections of the Movement, "though an almost incredible one, that Mr. Newman was totally unprepared for the reception which this most remarkable essay encountered both in the University and throughout the country. . . . He most conscientiously believed that the interpretation which he proposed, however new and however little consistent, in some parts at least, with their *prima facie* aspect, was yet fairly attributable to [the Articles]; and he expressed the greatest surprise when a friend (Mr. Ward) to whom he showed the Tract previously to publication, gave it as his opinion (entirely borne out by the result) that it would completely electrify the University and the Church."

It had not been published many days before there were symptoms in the University that something unusual was in the air.

The first impression caused by its appearance was thus described at the time by one who took an active part in the Movement:—

"A new tract has come out this week," wrote Mr. James Mozley to his sister, "and is beginning to make a sensation. It is on the Articles, and shows that they bear a highly Catholic mean-

ing; and that many doctrines of which the Romanist are corruptions, may be held consistently with them. This is no more than what we know as a matter of history, for the Articles were expressly worded to bring in Roman Catholics. But people are astonished and confused at the idea now, as if it were quite new. And they have been so accustomed for a long time to look at the Articles as on a par with the creed that they think, I suppose, that if they subscribe to them they are bound to hold whatever doctrines (not positively stated in them) are merely not condemned. So if they will have a Tractarian sense they are thereby all Tractarians. It is, of course, highly complimentary to the whole set of us to be so very much surprised that we should think what we held to be consistent with the Articles which we have subscribed."

On the same day as this letter was written the general feeling on the part of the Anti-Tractarians found vent in a protest—couched in the form of a letter to the Editor of the Tracts, and signed by four Oxford tutors — Mr. Tait, Mr. Churton, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Griffiths. The original draft was drawn up by Mr. Tait, who was the first to suggest the line of action pursued. It indicated five heads on matters of doctrine—(1) purgatory; (2) pardons; (3) the worshipping and adoration of images and relics; (4) the invocation of saints; (5) the mass: and declared that the Tract suggested that the Articles do not contain any condemnation of these doctrines, "as they are taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome; but only of certain absurd practices and opinions, which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do." In view of the dangerous tendency of this teaching as mitigating the differences between England and Rome, and as breaking down the guarantee which subscription was supposed to afford that Roman doctrine should not be preached by Anglican ministers, the four tutors requested the Editor of the Tracts to make known the writer's name. "Considering how very grave and solemn the whole subject is," they wrote, "we cannot help thinking that both the Church and the University are entitled to ask that some person, besides the printer and publisher of the Tract, should acknowledge himself responsible for its contents."

A week later, on 15th March, at a meeting of the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of houses, and Proctors, in the Delegates' room, the following resolution was carried:—

"Considering that it is enjoined in the statutes of this University that every student shall be instructed and examined in the Thirty-Nine Articles, and shall subscribe to them; considering also that a Tract has recently appeared, dated from Oxford, and entitled 'Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-Nine Articles,' being No. 90 of the *Tracts for the Times*, a series of anonymous publications purporting to be written by members of the University, but which are in no way sanctioned by the University itself—*Resolved*, that modes of interpretation such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of errors which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned statutes. "P. WYNTER (Vice-Chancellor)."

Mr. Newman wrote on the following day to the Vice-Chancellor acknowledging the authorship, and immediately afterwards published a letter, addressed to Dr. Jelf, then canon of Christ Church, in explanation of the Tract, with reference to the criticisms contained in the tutors' protest. In it he took exception to the tutors' statement that he had maintained the compatibility of the Articles with the authoritative teaching of Rome on the points specified. "I only say," he writes, "that whereas they were written before the decrees of Trent, they were not directed against those decrees. The Church of Rome taught authoritatively before those decrees as well as since. Those decrees expressed her authoritative teaching, and they will continue to express it while she so teaches. The simple question is, whether taken by themselves in their mere letter, they express it; whether in fact other senses short of the sense conveyed in the present authoritative teaching of the Roman Church will not fulfil their letter, and may not even now in point of fact be held in that Church." This explanation was followed by a strong condemnation of the present authoritative teaching of Rome "to judge by what we see of it in public," and viewed as a "popular system."

These subtle distinctions and qualifications exasperated his opponents, as we shall see directly, and eventually led Mr. Ward to enter the field, and to attempt to make absolutely clear what Mr. Newman preferred to leave to some extent undefined. On the other hand, the letter to Dr. Jelf avowed that its author held the question as to the views of the

Reformers—whether they were Protestant or Catholic—to be "an open one," and offered to withdraw the phrase he had applied to the Articles "ambiguous formularies." And these were necessary qualifications if he was to keep terms with the less Roman section of Tractarians represented by Dr. Pusey, and with the representatives of the High Church party.

The principal motive which led him to write the Tract is given in the following remarkable passage:—

"And now, if you will permit me to add a few words more, I will briefly state why I am anxious about securing this liberty for us. . . . There is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. I have always contended, and will contend, that it is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, bear witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of that something is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic.

"The question then is whether we shall give them up to the Roman Church or claim them for ourselves, as we well may, by reverting to that older system which has of late years indeed been superseded, but which has been and is quite congenial (to say the least), I should rather say proper and natural, or even necessary, to our Church. But if we do give them up, then we must give up the men who cherish them; we must consent either to give up the men or to admit their principles.

". . . The Tract is grounded on the belief that the Articles need not be so closed as the received method of teaching closes them, and ought not to be for the sake of many persons. If we will close them, we run the risk of subjecting persons whom we should least like to lose to the temptation of joining the Church of Rome. . . ."

The next event of importance was a message from the Bishop of Oxford to Mr. Newman, to the effect that he considered that the Tract was "objectionable, and may tend to

disturb the peace and tranquillity of the Church," giving moreover the Bishop's advice "that the *Tracts for the Times* should be discontinued." Newman at once wrote a letter to the Bishop expressing his readiness to comply, but vindicating the Tracts in general, and Tract 90 in particular, from the charges brought against them.

This was the end of the controversy so far as Mr. Newman himself was concerned. On the same day as that on which the letter to the Bishop of Oxford was published (29th March) appeared a second edition of Tract 90, with various additions and qualifications designed to meet the objections which had been made to it in its original form, and this was its author's last word.

However, the storm it had provoked did not so readily subside: pamphlets on either side continued to be published, and the Tract was the one subject of conversation in the common rooms, and much talked of throughout the country. Mr. Ward, from his intimacy with men of all schools of thought, was especially brought in contact with adverse criticisms; and the most common was one which he could least brook as against a leader he so deeply revered, and against a view which he himself adopted, the charge of disingenuousness. Liberals such as Stanley and Jowett, though quite ready to allow the latitude claimed by the Tract, deprecated the ambiguity and want of directness to be found in some of its expressions. The phrases introduced for the sake of the Puseyite section, which tolerated the view that the Reformers were Catholic in sympathy, and the attempt to veil the fact that the interpretations advocated were forced interpretations, seemed to them wanting in straightforwardness, where straightforwardness was most called for. The conclusion of the Tract, Stanley said years afterwards, was "veiled by the peculiar style of its powerful author." And it seems clear from Ward's remarks to Dr. Pusey quoted later on, that many others shared in this general impression.

Then Mr. Wilson, one of the four protesting tutors, published a letter complaining of Mr. Newman's ambiguity of expression, and vindicating the original protest with special reference to Mr. Newman's letter to Dr. Jelf. "That we felt a difficulty at the time," he wrote, "from what we thought a want of definiteness in

many expressions in the Tract, and were aware that if we stated the writer's meaning to be what it might be, or most probably was (to our apprehension) we might find afterwards that such was not his real meaning, is doubtless very clearly recollected by us all." And after going into detail as to what he considers Mr. Newman's ambiguous and shifting use of such terms as "authoritative teaching" of Rome, "received doctrine" of the schools, and so forth, and defending the original interpretation of the tutors, he says, "Nothing can be more unsatisfactory than the attempt to follow this writer through the shifting of his terms both in the letter and the Tract. . . . I cannot say that on the whole this letter is much more satisfactory to me than the Tract. There is found in it the same ambiguity of terms—the same shifting of terms—the same inapplicability of quotations to that which they are to prove."

This letter, which was hailed with great triumph by Tait and his associates, decided Mr. Ward to come forward. He wrote two pamphlets on the subject, entitled respectively *A Few Words*, and *A Few Words more—in defence of Tract* 90. He considered the trunk-line of argument in Tract 90 obviously straightforward and honest. But he did think it desirable that that line should be exhibited more plainly, and that certain parts of it should be more emphatically brought forward. He had no wish to defer to Dr. Pusey's moderate views, and he thought that such deference only confused the issue, and gave a certain colour to the charges in question. Thus, while Newman allowed it to be an open question whether the Reformers were Catholic or not in sentiment, though avowing the latter to be his own personal view, Ward maintained the latter view to be quite certain, and necessary to the argument. Again Newman spoke of subscribing the Articles in their "literal and grammatical sense"; Ward said plainly that they might be subscribed in a "non-natural" sense. Some of the interpretations in the Tract were forced,[1] and he thought that this should be openly admitted. Hence it followed that while Newman denied that the Articles were a difficulty to Catholics, Mr. Ward considered that they were a difficulty, though not insurmountable. So, too, the Tract laid stress on their not excluding doctrines held in the "Primitive Church"; Ward brought

[1] Some specimens of these interpretations are given in Appendix E.

forward what was admitted in the Tract but not dwelt on, that they need not, on the same principle, exclude obligatory Roman doctrine on the points in question. Newman offered to withdraw the phrase "ambiguous formularies" as applied to the Articles; Ward on the contrary considered his only hope to lie in their ambiguity. If not ambiguous many of them were certainly Protestant. The very ground, too, on which they could be submitted to such forced interpretations, was that the Reformers themselves were not straightforward or honest men; that they designedly left the phraseology ambiguous so as to admit Catholics, while preserving the rhetoric[1] and general tone of Protestant formularies to satisfy the Protestant Churches abroad. Writing to Dr. Pusey some months later he speaks as follows:—

"Affairs were in this state: Newman had written his Tract, and a great number of persons on all sides considered it disingenuous in the highest degree. From what my own acquaintances, who disliked it, said, it seemed clear to me that they did not understand its argument; and it struck me that it might be of the greatest importance that they should fully understand what he did mean. Especially they did not understand his very unfavourable opinion of the English Reformers and Reformation. I have heard him say several times, 'either the Reformers were disingenuous or my Tract is so,' and not understanding him to imply the former, people imputed to him the latter. Again, as he had at length expressed in print his dislike of the Reformation, it seemed most desirable for truth's sake that this should be strongly put forward. Again, before my first pamphlet, Wilson had published his, which many people thought quite crushing, though I felt that I could answer every word of it with great ease; and before my second two others were published which it was desirable to answer. I can most truly say that I would have given a great deal that any one else should have published rather than myself, but no one seemed likely to do so. On the other hand your own pamphlet was coming out, and not unlikely to be succeeded by others on the same side, which would tend the more to blind people to Newman's Anti-Reformation feelings, from their tendency to consider you almost his authorised interpreter. . . ."

He explained and defended the course he adopted to other friends also on similar grounds. He thought that fuller and completer statements were needed in the interests of fairplay. The views of all parties should be considered and answered from the Tractarian standpoint, and that standpoint should be

[1] See Oakeley's *Tractarian Movement*, p. 45.

explained unequivocally.[1] Nor would he allow the justice of a remonstrance made by Mr. Tait that his action was in opposition to the Bishop's message to Mr. Newman already referred to. His pamphlet, he said, referred to the doctrine of the Tract, while the Bishop's sentence was purely disciplinary. The Bishop had said of the Tract that it was "objectionable and may tend to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the Church." Mr. Ward commented on this: "It might do the latter whether from being 'objectionable' in the time of its appearance, or in the manner in which it advocated its point, as being indirect, or satirical, or ambiguous, or incomplete in its statements; if the former were the reason, at all events the time is no longer in the choice of any one of us, and the controversy must proceed; if the latter, it is even co-operating with his Lordship's judgment to throw the same positions, so far as may be, into another shape; and I have anxiously endeavoured [that my pamphlets] may be neither indirect, satirical, nor ambiguous." He begins his first pamphlet by saying that he has come to the determination of writing with reference to Mr. Wilson's letter—

". . . not as being unmindful of the great evils to which direct theological controversy, unless great care be used on both sides, may lead, but still considering that in the present case a view of part of our Articles new in great measure at least to the present generation, will hardly meet with general acceptance till after full and fair discussion, and that those who feel difficulties in that view have a fair claim on those who advocate it that their objections shall be at least considered. I should not," he adds, "do justice to my own feelings if I did not add that another reason which would less disincline one to controversy on the present occasion than on most others is the most remarkably temperate and Christian tone of the paper to which Mr. Wilson was a party, and which began the contest; a tone which may well encourage one in sanguine hopes that the beginning having been made in such a spirit, whatever may be said on either side may be said on the whole in a temper not unworthy of the great importance of the subject."

The phrase "authoritative teaching" had been one chief source of misunderstanding, as Mr. Newman had used it in more senses than one. One of Mr. Ward's chief objects was to point out that even where the Tract could in this matter be

[1] See, *e.g.* letter to Mr. Scott, p. 169.

accused of ambiguity of language, its meaning was very plain and straightforward. He summarises Newman's position thus:—

"Mr. Newman's opinion then is, that the doctrines on these subjects condemned by the Articles are not taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome in the sense of being obligatory on the belief of each individual member of the Church, or so that that Church is irrevocably bound to them; that they are taught authoritatively in that they are not merely 'practices and opinions which intelligent Romanists repudiate as much as we do,' but 'maintained and acted on in the Roman Church,' 'actually taught in that Church,' 'an existing ruling spirit and view in that Church,' 'which is a corruption and perversion of the truth,' and 'which I think the XXXIX Articles speak of' (Letter, p. 10). . . . Authoritative teaching may naturally mean the teaching of those in authority; but then individuals, members of the Roman Church, are not bound to believe such teaching, except so far as it is borne out by that Church's authoritative statements: the Tract considers the Articles as directed against the authoritative teaching so lamentably prevalent throughout the Roman Church, not the authoritative statements of that Church herself."

It will not be to our purpose at this distance of time to go into close details of a subtle controversy; all I shall attempt is to note some salient features illustrative of Mr. Ward's share in it and of his mental characteristics.

His main thesis, over and above the detailed defence of the Tract, is "that in the Articles in dispute . . . a remarkable attempt" is evident "on the part of the framers to present an imposing external appearance of Protestantism, while nothing is decided which might prevent those who deferred more really than they did to primitive authority from subscribing." Further, where the condemnations are express, there is "truth in point of doctrine and error in point of fact;—truth of doctrine in declaring certain opinions condemnable, error in fact in considering them held by the more religious Roman Catholics."

Though professing only to defend the Tract, and though he attempted, in deference to the advice of others, to conceal the strength of his own sympathy with the existing Roman Church, symptoms of it appeared in the first pamphlet, and still plainer ones in the second. The University authorities were not likely to be pleased with such a passage as the following:

—"It is much to be wished that Roman Catholic writers would remember that it is not incumbent on any member of our Church to maintain our superiority to them either in formal statement or in practice. We do not deny their communion to be part of the Universal Church, though they deny ours to be so."

The influence of Newman's teaching as to the practical corruptions of Rome, however, remained; and though he might consider the practical corruptions of Anglicanism greater still, he held by the proverb, *Spartam nactus es, hanc exorna;* secession was not obligatory, for the Anglican Church was a branch, if a corrupt one, of the Catholic Church. "May we not allude to this as one of the numberless marks we have on us of being a living branch of Christ's Church, that the Roman Church and ours together make up so far more an adequate representation of the early Church (our several defects and practical corruptions as it were protesting against each other) than either separately." Still the condition of being able to look upon the English Church as a branch of the Catholic Church is, that when she makes use of certain formularies, they must bear an interpretation consistent with the doctrine of the Primitive Church. Such formularies come to one who so believes, not as bare words or expressions, to be understood only by reference to their own inherent drift, but as the words of a Church whose views we in great part know from her past history;—"as the words of some old and revered friend whom we have known long and well, and who has taught us high and holy lessons; and if after such long experience we hear from him words which at first sound strangely, we interpret them if possible in accordance with his well-known spirit. If they absolutely refuse to be so explained, we recognise with sorrow that we have mistaken his character; but in proportion to our experience of the preciousness of his former counsels, in proportion to our perception of the plain traces he still bears upon him of his former self, are we unwilling to believe that any of his expressions may not be so interpreted."

In conclusion he writes:—

"One reason in addition may be mentioned, why to remain in our own Church, and by God's help to elevate its tone, cannot be

looked at by the Catholic Christian as the cold performance of a duty (though a plain duty of course it is), but a labour of love. Many persons who have been by God's grace led into what they deem the truth, are most deeply sensible that in the number of those who think otherwise, are still very many persons so much their superiors in religious attainments, that the idea of even a comparison is most painful. Yet religious truth is the especial inheritance of such persons, who nevertheless, whether from the prepossessions of education, or the inadequate way in which that truth has been brought before them, have hitherto failed to recognise God's mark upon it. Can there be a task more full of interest and hope, than in all possible ways, especially by the careful ordering of our own lives and conversations, to do what in us lies to set before such persons in a manner which may overcome their adverse impressions, that one image of the Catholic Church, which, could they but see it, is the real satisfaction of their restless cravings, and the fit reward for their patient continuance in well-doing? Yet such a task is exclusively ours as members of the English Church, and may well add one to the many associations and bonds of love which bind us to that Holy Mother, through whom we received our new birth. May we all have grace to labour worthily in the pious task of building her up in truth and purity, with loving-tenderness indeed towards all branches of the Catholic Church, but with an especial and dutiful attachment to her."

This pamphlet, which was Ward's first public utterance on behalf of advanced views, drew upon him the remonstrance of many friends. I have already referred to the withdrawal by Tait and Woolcombe of the invitation they had given him to co-operate with their official care of the undergraduates. Robert Scott, another of his brother Fellows, also remonstrated with him in a letter, to which Ward replied by a vindication of his action, which must be quoted at length:—

"OXFORD, *27th April* 1841.

"MY DEAR SCOTT—I am much obliged to you for the letter I received from you this morning. Of course it is a person's own fault if he does not put to good account every criticism on his proceedings which may reach him, and in this case I think it a great kindness that, thinking as you do, you have stated your opinion to me so plainly. I feel that while I share with you an objection to 'enter into controversy on the subject,' I shall be putting your letter to one use which you intended, if I take the liberty of saying a few words as to my reasons for thinking as I think and acting as I have acted; that even though you do not agree with them, you

may see that it is not hastily and without thought that I have proceeded.

"As to the Tract itself, there were reasons besides those very important ones which Newman mentioned to Jelf, which made me rejoice more at the appearance of No. 90 than at anything which has yet been done. Of course I know, and am very sorry to know, that you do not agree with me: but I will mention two. The first is that I hail with so great joy anything which promises us a closer union, whether in *ethos* or in doctrine, with foreign Churches. This the Tract seemed especially calculated to do; for, first, it tended to show English Churchmen that many practices which they censured in foreigners were not condemned by our own Church; and, secondly, it tended to show Roman Churchmen that many corruptions which shock and offend us in them are as strongly condemned in their own formularies as in ours. To show that subscription to the Council of Trent is not inconsistent with that to the Thirty-Nine Articles, so far as that is shown in the Tract, is plainly no small step towards sympathy between the Churches respectively sanctioning those formularies. The second reason I will mention is, that the tone of the introduction, and, indirectly, also of the conclusion, so remarkably draws the attention of English churchmen to (what many, myself included, consider) the miserable condition of our own Church. We are, not unnaturally, very much more sensitively alive to the miserable corruptions prevalent abroad than the miserable corruptions prevalent at home; and, for my own part, till we have the grace of humility in a far higher measure than the English Church since the schism of the sixteenth century seems generally to have had it, I see no hope of our Church taking anything like its proper place either in England or in Christendom. I think that all yet done in the way of restoring Church principles is comparatively of no importance except as a foundation to build this upon. This has been very forcibly expressed in a pamphlet just put out by Keble, and printed though not published. Of course I fear there is little chance of your agreeing with either of these views; I am only mentioning some among the reasons which make people who do hold them exceedingly attached to No. 90, and very anxious at whatever sacrifice to do what in them lies to help it. At the same time I quite agree with your next remark, that it is a terrible thing to make the enemies of the Lord blaspheme! It is a very deep source of grief that so many seem to consider the tract a Jesuitical play upon words by which anything may mean anything. I fear from your letter to Tait that you are almost of the number of those who think so (of course I do not suppose you to charge it with corrupt motives), and I feel it a very severe trial that so many serious persons are shocked in their notions of goodness and holiness, when they think they see persons of great preten-

sions [to sanctity] sanction by their example gross dishonesty. And as I am most firmly convinced, the more so the more I consider the subject (which is no new one to me, as is to be expected in the case of one who signed the Articles for deacon's orders in Arnold's and for priest's in Newman's sense of them), that this interpretation is perfectly honest and legitimate, it was this feeling which induced me, at considerable sacrifice of personal feeling, to write my pamphlet; the one great object of which was to draw out from the rather peculiar form in which Newman had thrown it, the real and substantial argument of his Tract, on those points to which I had heard of objections. I found there was no one else prepared to undertake it, and for the sake of all parties it seemed almost necessary to be undertaken. . . . [He defends himself against the charge of disregarding the Bishop's judgment in words almost identical with those quoted in page 163, and then proceeds.]

"In order to support what Newman conscientiously believed the true view, it was necessary either to hint or openly to state his extremely unfavourable views of the English Reformers. From a wish to avoid giving unnecessary offence he chose the former method; for those who misunderstood that and charged Newman with disingenuousness where he meant to charge the Reformers with it, I thought a short pamphlet, if they happened to read it, putting these charges against the Reformers more fully out might be serviceable. It would certainly be in no way contravening the Bishop's judgment, and very probably might be exactly co-operating with it. . . .

"As to my position in the College the case is different. Every Head of a house is the sole judge what theology he will have taught there authoritatively; and from the moment the censure of the Hebdomadal Board appeared, I felt it a plain duty to give back to Tait and Woolcombe the charge they had entrusted me with. It is not the writing, the *holding* views so pointedly condemned by one's own Head inclusively, makes it to my mind a plain duty to act as I acted. Tait happened to speak to me on the subject before I directly mentioned it to him; but he knows that from the first I intended nothing else. But if you mean that the office, whether of Mathematical Lecturer or Fellow, should preclude a person from advocating in public views on theology which he is perfectly convinced are both true and most important, because the Head of his house is known to think very differently, I cannot acquiesce in such a view; nor of course could I in that case retain either of those offices. No one can be justified in precluding himself from the power of speaking out on such points, where the Church does not command his silence. . . .

"I think I have now adverted to all the points you mentioned: and can only repeat (1) my thanks for your expressing your feelings

to me so openly; (2) that I am far from wishing to engage in controversy, only to express the views (right or wrong) under which I have acted, and which it struck me you might not quite understand; (3) that any weak points you observe in the arguments of my pamphlet it would be a real kindness if you would point out to me, that in case I reach a second edition they may be amended. It seems to me that some further discussion is necessary under present circumstances. We cannot expect people to receive a view in many respects so strange to them without much difficulty and misgiving; and I feel convinced the more the matter is sifted on both sides in a right spirit the more clearly will the truth (on whichever side it be) emerge.—Believe me, my dear Scott, yours very sincerely,

"W. G. WARD."

The controversy did not flag. The bulk of the High Church party, whatever misgivings they had as to portions of the Tract, adopted its reasoning in the main, and Mr. Palmer wrote in its defence. Dr. Arnold's school were at work attacking it in the *Edinburgh Review*, and in the University there were men who loved the Protestant elements of Anglicanism, and were ready to take the field in their behalf.

Mr. Robert Lowe, afterwards so distinguished in the political world, published anonymously a pamphlet called *The Articles as construed by themselves*, in which he pleaded against having recourse to any external guide in the interpretation of the Articles, which should, he contended, be simply viewed in the most natural meaning they bear in themselves, and without reference to the intentions of the framers. He repeated, too, in the roundest terms the charge of dishonesty against the principles of the Tract. This pamphlet and an article in the *Edinburgh Review* brought Mr. Ward for a second time into the field. In May he published his *Few More Words in defence of Tract* 90. He gives as one of his reasons for coming forward again: "The deep grief that all must feel who really reverence the Oxford writers, at the impression [that they] advocate a Jesuitical (in the popular sense of the word) principle by which anything may mean anything, and forms may be subscribed at the most solemn period of our life only to be dishonestly explained away." With regard to Mr. Lowe's main contention, Mr. Ward writes as follows:—

"As to the general view of the pamphlet, it seems to have much force. . . . At the same time I would wish to urge

the writer on to his legitimate conclusions. Let him remember, that the clergy not only '*ex animo* subscribe' the Articles, but 'give their assent and consent to the Book of Common Prayer,' and profess 'that there is nothing in it contrary to the Word of God. And though the pamphlet maintains the Articles to be Protestant, its author will hardly deny the Prayer-book to be Catholic. Yet if this be so, he must explain the letter of the one, so far as may be, by the spirit of the other. Whichever he chooses as the foundation, the spirit of the one, on his own showing, must be neglected, and the letter explained drily, and (what he would call) disingenuously. . . ."

The real question, however, at issue between himself and Mr. Lowe is thus expressed by him: "Are we to look at the Articles as of the nature of a creed intended to teach doctrine, or of the nature of a joint declaration intended to be vague and to include persons of discordant sentiments?" And on this question he maintains the latter to be obviously the true view.

Mr. Lowe in his rejoinder avowed himself the author of the pamphlet, and defended his own position; condemning Mr. Ward's and Mr. Newman's views very unequivocally as immoral:—

"In avowing myself the author of a pamphlet which Mr. Ward has recently honoured with his notice," he wrote, "I feel that I owe some apology to the public for having, although a layman, entered into this controversy. My excuse is that the view I took of the subject was rather moral than theological. . . . I do think (to borrow Mr. Newman's illustration) that the Articles are not a heap of stones, but a building; and that he who induces himself by thirty-nine distinct quibbles to assent to them piecemeal, and then denies them as a whole, is guilty of the most hateful verbal sophistry and mental reservation. If this be indeed a paradox, it is a paradox of which I am not and have no reason to be ashamed."

But the interest of Mr. Ward's second pamphlet, and its effect on the course of the Movement, were due mainly to his language respecting the Reformers and Reformation. Pusey was known to be preparing a defence of the Tract, in which a favourable view of the Reformation would be advocated. This question was, as I have said, the rock on which the Tractarians split and divided into two parties, the Romanisers and the more moderate school. Newman had passed the question

over as of small account, and the difference of opinion might have been scarcely noticed had it not been brought into the boldest relief by Mr. Ward in his pamphlet. Referring to Newman's language in the Tract, Mr. Ward writes thus:—

"He intimates, not very obscurely (Tract, p. 79), that in releasing [the English Church] from the Roman supremacy her then governors were guilty of rebellion, and considering that they had also sworn obedience to the Pope, for my own part I see not how we can avoid adding—of perjury. The point on which Mr. Newman would take his stand is this: that, estimating the sin at the highest, it was not 'that special sin which cuts off from the fountains of grace, and is called schism;' and this position (no one can deny that it is a difficult one) he maintained in an article he has since acknowledged, in the *British Critic* a year ago. If the Edinburgh reviewer is willing to discuss the argument of that article, he is at perfect liberty to do so; one does not see how anything but good can come from a fair and accurate consideration of it. But what does seem surprising is, that, while he labours and makes quotations to show what Mr. Newman not only does not deny, but expressly maintains, that Cranmer and Ridley were of different sentiments from himself on most subjects (p. 280), he treats the very question on which the whole position of his opponents depends in the following strain: '*Every one must be astonished* that men professing (these opinions) should continue to hold appointments in a church, which is *generally understood* to have been founded on the most positive denial of most of these doctrines, and on a consequent secession from the great society which continued to hold them. It is a *notorious historical fact*, that the doctrines in question . . . as a whole, . . . have been rejected by *all Protestant communities*' (p. 273). Let him prove to us that the Church of England is a Protestant community; that it was founded on the denial of Catholic doctrines; that it seceded from the ancient English Church which witnessed these doctrines, let him prove this; and, though the Articles were as obviously on our side as he considers them overwhelmingly against us, our conscience could not allow us to remain one moment in a communion which had thus forfeited the gifts of grace."

Dr. Pusey, on his side, published a defence of Tract 90 (couched in the form of a letter to Dr. Jelf) in which he took the line of proving that it advocated only what many post-Reformation English divines had already advocated. So far as the plain admissions of the Tract went, doubtless Dr. Pusey's contention was sound; and indeed Mr. Newman himself vindi-

cated the line he had taken on the same ground. But the implications that Rome was not irrevocably committed to anything inconsistent with the Articles, that the Tridentine decrees admitted of an interpretation consistent with them, that the Reformers may have been guilty of rebellion, that Rome was in possession of a religious *ethos* not to be found elsewhere—these suggestions in the Tract, and in his own letter in its defence, showed a line of thought which must have made his Puseyite friends uneasy. Mr. Ward insisted on these symptoms as indications of a line of thought which, if it meant anything, must mean what he himself openly expressed. On the other hand, the moderate party could point to the contrast in their language, and tried to account for the suggestions of a directly Roman character as being thrown out, not in consequence of Mr. Newman's own leanings in the direction of Rome, but for the sake of those who felt as Mr. Ward felt. Thus the two schools had a similar plea. One said that the Roman suggestions were for the sake of Ward and Oakeley, while Newman's own view was more in accordance with that of the Anglican divines. The other averred that the hesitation shown in the Tract to speak strongly against the Reformers, or to confess openly that the interpretations advocated were in some cases forced ones, was for the sake of Pusey, while Mr. Newman's real view was identical with Mr. Ward's.

Still the Puseyites could point with great effect to the contrast between the language used in the Tract on the one hand, and in Mr. Ward's defence on the other. For instance, Mr. Newman spoke of the objection based on the Articles, as "groundless." "That there are real difficulties to a Catholic Christian," he wrote, "in the ecclesiastical position of our Church at this day no one can deny; but the statements of the Articles are not in their number. . . . Our present scope is merely to show that, while our Prayer-book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles, also the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine." Not so Mr. Ward. The basis of his own defence of the Tract was much less favourable, alike to the Articles themselves and to their framers. "He gave," writes the Dean of St. Paul's, "a new aspect and new issues to

the whole controversy. The Articles, to him, were a difficulty which they were not to the writer of No. 90, or to Dr. Pusey, or to Mr. Keble. To him they were not only the 'offspring of an uncatholic age,' but in themselves uncatholic. And his answer to the charge of dishonest subscription was, not that the Articles 'in their natural meaning are Catholic,' but that the system of the English Church is a compromise between what is Catholic and what is Protestant, and that the Protestant parties in it are involved in even greater difficulties, in relation to subscription and use of its formularies, than the Catholic. He admitted that he did evade the spirit, but accepted the 'statements' of the Articles, maintaining that this was the intention of their original framers. With characteristic boldness, inventing a phrase which has become famous, he wrote, 'Our Twelfth Article is as plain as words can make it on the evangelical side. Of course I think its natural meaning may be explained away, for I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense.' But he showed that Evangelicals, high-church Anglicans, and Latitudinarians were equally obliged to have recourse to explanations, which to all but themselves were unsatisfactory."

But while Dr. Pusey and those who felt with him considered Ward's pamphlet as violent and extreme, and as going far beyond Newman's own views, it is plain from the correspondence given in pages 177-184 that Newman himself did not at that time distinctly repudiate Ward's view. And there were others, supporters and opponents alike of the Tract, who looked upon his pamphlets as only a plain and open avowal of opinions which Mr. Newman, from the difficulty of his position, or as some said from the over-subtlety of his mind, declined to state expressly. Thus Stanley considered that the real conclusion of the Tract was "that all Roman doctrine might be held within the limits of the English Church."[1] And the tutors, who had been exasperated by the "shifting of terms" in Tract 90, welcomed Ward's unreserved exposition of his principles as a tangible and substantial object of attack, in place of the will-o'-the-wisp which had provoked them and eluded their grasp. Mr. Ward writes to Mr. Pusey in July 1841: ". . . Tait, among others, told me he was particularly pleased with my way of putting

[1] See *Edinburgh Review*, April 1881, Article, "The Oxford School."

things, and that several people liked it very much. Jowett, one of our younger Fellows, who himself has great difficulty in subscribing the Articles, told me that no theory could possibly satisfy his mind which did not acknowledge the plain fact that the Reformers were anti-Catholic, and expressed himself very warmly in favour of my second pamphlet." And Mr. Oakeley, accepting Mr. Ward's view to the full, wrote a pamphlet designed to show that the historical records of the Reformation bear out the conclusion with respect to the Articles, which Mr. Ward defended from their internal structure.

The publication of Ward's second pamphlet led to further steps against him on the part of his Balliol associates. Tait and other Fellows represented to the Master that the Roman bias of the pamphlet was so strong, as to make its author unfit for the position of Logical and Mathematical Lecturer —a position which necessarily brought him in contact with young men, at a time of life when influence is readily gained. The Master, who always had a personal liking for Ward, was not very eager in the matter at first; however he undertook to read the pamphlet. He was no great theologian, and his first attempt to make his way through the ninety pages of close logic and technical phraseology proved a failure. He was discovered by one of the undergraduates asleep in his arm-chair, with a copy of a *A Few Words More* in his hands. For a time it was thought that the matter had blown over, and that Ward's tutorship was safe. However, a second attempt was made to rouse the Master's slumbering energies. Strong passages were pointed out—against the existing Anglican system and against the authorities of the establishment. Such sentences as the following were, perhaps, brought before his notice:—"Let those whose love for [the English Church] is lukewarm content themselves with mourning in private over her decayed condition; her true and faithful children will endeavour to awaken the minds of their brethren to a sense of her present degradation." "It is difficult to estimate the amount of responsibility she year by year incurs on account of those . . . who remain buried in the darkness of Protestant error, because she fails in her duty of holding clearly forth the light of Gospel truth." The Master was much shocked. "He is a most dangerous man," he said; and he braced himself up to the unpleasant task of calling

upon the offender to resign his tutorship. Those who remember the events connected with this measure describe Dr. Jenkyns as in a very uncomfortable state of mind. Mr. Ward's great urbanity, and the friendliness of their relations made his task especially hard. "Really Tait," he said, "when I meet Ward and talk to him, I find him so amusing and so agreeable, that it is almost impossible to believe that he is the same man who says those *dreadful* things in print." Of the two lectureships held by Mr. Ward the Logical lectureship gave the Master most uneasiness. "What *heresy* may he not insinuate," he said, "under the form of a syllogism!" Dr. Jenkyns, after some hesitation, had screwed up his courage to the necessary interview, when, to his surprise and intense relief, Ward came up to him one day and said, "Master, I have come to resign my two lectureships into your hands. I have heard of your wishes," he proceeded, "and of course feel it my duty to defer to them; and I am sure you are right from your point of view. I must, if your views on these questions are the true ones, be a most dangerous man, and I don't see that you had any choice in the matter. You were bound to take what steps you could against me." The Master was quite disarmed. "Really, Ward, this is just like your generosity." [1]

While the opinions expressed in Ward's pamphlet brought him into trouble with the authorities at Balliol, they caused no little anxiety to his friends of various shades of opinion. "Where is it to end?" they asked. A position which so strained the extremest boundaries of Anglicanism could not satisfy him permanently, and the Roman Church itself seemed even then to be his ultimate destination. "There remains," wrote Dean Scott to Tait, "a question of most painful interest to those who know him and think of him as you and I do—what do you think is likely to become of him now? I ask not *a priori*, but what seems he himself to think of his position?" Dr. Pusey brought matters to an issue by sending him a message through Oakeley, asking for a distinct pledge that he would not join the Roman Church; and Ward, though declaring that secession was far from his thoughts, refused to give such a

[1] An account is given of this scene in Canon Oakeley's *Balliol under Dr. Jenkyns*. I have added one or two particulars communicated to me from other sources. Professor Jowett's account of it is given in the *Appendix*.

pledge. This in itself was serious enough; but it was rendered far more serious in the correspondence which followed, by his explicit claim of Newman's sanction for all his opinions. As we have seen, in the letter to Dr. Jelf, Newman had professed to claim as allowable opinions which had been regarded as dangerously approaching to Romanism, mainly with reference to others more extreme than himself. The points wherein the extreme party differed from Dr. Pusey's following he had treated as open questions; and an attempt was thus made to avoid the appearance of a separation between the two leaders. We see from the *Apologia*, however, that Newman was really uncertain of his position, and had a suspicion that after all the "extreme party" might prove to be right. Ward himself considered that Newman went further than this, and had given positive sanction to his own views; and to bring matters to an issue he expressed his willingness to give up any single opinion, if it could be shown him that Newman disapproved of it. If this challenge remained unanswered it was plain that the check which had previously been put upon the growth and development of extreme views by Newman's strong hand, must cease to exist; and the division of the party into two camps, the Romanisers and the Puseyites, must become more and more marked.

Some extracts from the defence of his position which he wrote to Dr. Pusey in July 1841 will illustrate this state of things—

"With regard," he wrote, "to Newman's sanction of [*A Few Words more in defence of Tract* 90] he told me that he did not know a single sentiment expressed in it in which he did not altogether concur. He said that I had my way of saying things and he his, and that his was a very different way from mine; but this is connected with the manner, not matter."

Again, in reply to Dr. Pusey's expostulation with him for accusing the Reformers of disingenuousness, he wrote—

"'Solutions short of this,' you say, 'have satisfied older men.' They have not satisfied Newman; and I speak in my pamphlet on this subject only as expressing what he has said in the Tract. But might I submit to you, are there many persons who on the one hand do not accuse the Reformers of disingenuousness, and yet on the other consider the following doctrines and practices allowed by the Articles—(1) Invocation of saints; (2) Veneration of images and

relics; (3) An intermediate state of purification with pain; (4) The reservation of the host; (5) The elevation of the host (you do not touch on these last in your pamphlet); (6) The infallibility of some general councils; (7) The doctrine of desert by congruity (in the received Roman sense); (8) The doctrine that the Church ought to enforce celibacy on the clergy?"

He states his absolute readiness to defer to Newman on the points in debate in the following terms:—

". . . I would at once give up any theological opinion I am inclined to if I knew Newman to differ from it; and also (with regard to what you wrote to Oakeley) . . . I found my notion of Newman's views not on what he allows to be said in his presence without contradiction, but on what he says himself, either voluntarily or in answer to questions."

Another question, and that of a very practical character, arose—as to the validity of the Anglican sacraments, and the laxity of view allowed within the establishment in a matter on Catholic principles so important. Here Ward represented Newman's view to be identical with his own; and Father Lockhart's account, given in a subsequent chapter,[1] of what passed between him and Newman on the subject at Littlemore a year later, seems to show that such was the case. On this question Mr. Ward wrote to Dr. Pusey as follows:—

"I have heard Newman say that it is, to say the least, doubtful whether there can be said to be a valid sacrament administered unless the priest adds mentally what our Eucharistic service omits. . . . Williams of King's College, Cambridge, mentioned to Newman in my hearing that the Bishop of Lincoln in speaking to him at the time of his ordination, laughed at the notion of an apostolical succession as having 'passed through Pope Joan,' and Newman said, 'If even the Bishop of Lincoln talks so what must we say of the majority of our Bishops,' or I believe words rather stronger."

But independently of the question of Newman's sanction of the matter of the pamphlets, Dr. Pusey had expressed his disapproval of their tone and of their language in respect of the Reformers and Reformation. He was evidently unprepared for it, and told Oakeley that he wished the advanced school would speak to him more openly of their views and feelings. This drew from Ward a long *Apologia*, of which I proceed to quote portions. Before entering on the actual merits of the

[1] See p. 210.

question in debate, he begins by claiming "the lowest place" for himself:—

"As the line which I shall have to take will be that of defending myself against the censure which I am grieved to find you consider my pamphlet to deserve, it will not be wrong, I hope, to begin by expressing my full conviction that, apart from the particular instance of my pamphlet, I deserve far more severe judgment than any you have passed; and that I am perfectly convinced that, as it is, you think far better of me than the truth warrants. I say this, I trust, with perfect sincerity, and I hope you will do me the justice to bear it in mind during this letter, if what I shall say may appear either egotistical or self-complacent. I hope then that it is from no unwillingness to bear blame that I have wished to write; but as my faults, such as they are, have not in general, so far as I can see, any direct connection with (what I am very sorry that you consider) extreme opinions [and are not such as others holding those opinions are inclined to],—both for the sake of those others and of the opinions themselves, it seemed better to say what might be said. And as to those others, as I understand from Oakeley there was some misunderstanding, I might mention that A., B.,[1] and J. Morris (I think also T. Morris) have expressed to me in the strongest terms their agreement with my pamphlet; and that they have all, I know quite well, to say the least, quite as much tendency to Rome as myself. To make an end of this part of the subject. There is one of those faults which I suppose any one would observe in me, which might appear connected both with what are called strong opinions and with my pamphlet, viz. my tendency to unreal and hasty talking. I hope in this respect I am a good deal better than I was; but at all events as to my pamphlet I had the danger of it continually before my thoughts, and endeavoured to check it as far as possible, and abstained from saying some things I was inclined to say. The fact also of both Newman and Oakeley seeing it would be a further check."

Dr. Pusey had remonstrated with him for the positiveness of the tone of the pamphlets, which did not, he said, become so young a man. In reply to this, Mr. Ward writes:—

"But I feel myself that a preliminary step requires explanation and apology, viz. so young a man writing at all on the subject; especially a young man so recently saved from heretical opinions, and still probably in consequence imbued with so much of the heretical spirit. I answer (1) that it was not on a point of theology at all, nor, as I say in my second pamphlet, on a point on which

[1] Mentioning two members of the Oxford school who have in the event remained Anglicans.

moral qualities are of especial importance; but almost entirely intellectual acuteness: and this, rightly or wrongly, I believe myself to possess. (2) It was a point to which, from circumstances, I had paid particular attention. When I was ordained deacon, I signed the Prayer-book and Articles pretty much in Dr. Arnold's sense of them. At that time one of my brother Fellows had scruples in signing my testimonials, and this of course led me to a careful consideration of the question. On the other hand, when ordained priest (two years and a half subsequently), I signed them in their catholic sense, and then, too, I was naturally led to the renewed consideration of the question on a different side: nor do I hesitate to say that I felt on the whole more difficulty the second time than the first."

He then refers, in the passage quoted earlier (p. 162), to the feeling in the University as to the disingenuousness of the Tract, and to his fear lest the mild interpretation which Pusey himself was known to be preparing might blind people to its true significance. So much as to his reasons for writing. As to his tone he says:—

"On the subject of my 'positive tone,' I may say that I was very anxious to avoid such, though I may very likely have been unsuccessful. The only subjects on which any other tone seemed wrong were points of catholic faith and practice. On them I thought it would be uncharitable, as well as otherwise wrong, to speak of them as matters of opinion or as admitting of doubt, merely because very great numbers in our Church unhappily doubt them: it seemed in a smaller way like a Christian missionary who in a heathen country should seem to the people merely to recommend to them Christianity, not as the true religion which claimed acceptance and was certainly true, but as the purest form of theism and for which there were probable arguments."

So far as the sentiments expressed in the two pamphlets were concerned, the two points upon which Dr. Pusey had taken him to task were the strong condemnation of the Reformers and Reformation, and his openly avowed admiration for the existing Roman system. On the former point he pleads guilty without reserve. His bad opinion of them originated, he says, long before he joined the Movement. He proceeds as follows:—

"I think it was far from unlikely that when I became serious enough (if ever I should do so) to really feel such questions as of practical importance, I might have joined the Roman Church; such a book, *e.g.* as Milner's *Letters to a Prebendary*, seemed quite con-

clusive to me against the Reformation. I am quite certain I never could have followed the Tracts' teaching as long as the writers upheld that movement: my conscience would not have allowed it. Then out came Froude, of which it is little to say that it delighted me more than any book of the kind I ever read: from that time began my inclination to see the truth where I trust it is. The especial charm in it to me was, combined on the other hand with his great strictness, his hatred of our present system and of the Reformers, and his sympathy with the rest of Christendom. And surely it is not wrong for a private person to follow the judgment of such as Newman, Keble, and Froude on such a question: yet what more strong censure is it possible to pass on our Reformation and Reformed Church than this one of Froude's, and this not in a letter, but intended for publication: 'At length she (the English Church), under Henry VIII., fell; will she ever rise again?' 'But why consider them guilty of perjury?' I will mention exactly what passed with Newman on that subject. When I got to that part of my pamphlet and read these words, he smiled a good deal and said, 'Yes; I don't see how that can do other than follow: but you know history is not my line, you must speak to the fact,'—to the fact, of course, that they took the oath of obedience to the Pope. I think that if we read in Le Bas's *Life of Cranmer*, *e.g.* the oath which he took, and his own secret protest (secret, that is, from the Pope's representatives, and the Pope was the *imponens*), no other view than perjury is possible. I think that Le Bas's defence and Palmer's defence (in his book on the Church), to my mind, by their futility, only make the charge more certainly true. But indeed I do not speak of Cranmer especially in my pamphlet, I merely mention the plain fact that Bishops who had sworn spiritual obedience to Rome released our Church from that supremacy, *i.e.* made a revolution in the Church without the sanction of that power to which they had sworn spiritual allegiance. Newman, not I, accuses them of rebellion; surely the rebellion of those sworn to obey is by the very force of terms perjury."

On the second point, his admiration for Rome, he was prepared to make several qualifications. He admitted the existence of much that was corrupt in her practical teaching, and more in the habits tolerated among her children. All he contended for was, that of the two—the English and the Roman—the latter was, in spite of her corruptions, "a great deal purer . . . her system higher, her sons much more favoured." Still he wrote:—

"It has always seemed to me most probable, that whatever our own Church's own faults, to justify a change of communion a far

more perfect and pure image of a Christian Church ought to be presented than any which Rome in her present state can offer. I believe indeed that the points in which I cannot follow your teaching are much more connected with our own Church than the Roman; to the best of my remembrance I follow quite fully all that you say in your new pamphlet about the latter. You asked J. Morris once if I was aware of those shocking doctrines being taught; I had read St. Alphonsus' book about a year ago in French, and was exceedingly shocked by it, so much so that while Newman was employed upon his letter to Dr. Jelf, I suggested to him whether he would think it advisable to mention it; nor do any of Newman's expressions in that letter go at all beyond what I habitually feel on the corruptions encouraged by the Church of Rome. What Newman expresses in the passage quoted in my pamphlet from the *British Critic* has been long my full conviction, that all branches of the Church since the schism of the sixteenth century have been so lamentably corrupt that without faith in the promises of permanence we could hardly believe the Church still to exist upon earth;—and the fact of such general corruption is in itself so awful and subduing that it is sad work to cast stones at each other. From what you said to Oakeley it has struck me that you would not consider it any disrespect, but rather the reverse, if I should speak as plainly as possible to you on all present theological subjects on which I feel strongly, and accordingly I have the less scruple in putting out more clearly what seems to me to be so corrupt in our own Church, and I have therefore thought over the matter a little, to draw out what was implicitly in my mind, and though well aware I shall not be able nearly to state the full amount of my feeling on the subject I will do my best.

"The present condition, then, of our Church seems to me corrupt in every sense in which we can use the word, except so far as corruption implies the perversion of truth, and in some respects our Church would rather appear to be without the truth than to have perverted it: but then such imperfections (to use Newman's phrase in his new article) would seem even worse than corruptions. The present condition of our Church seems to me to have had its origin in rebellion, perjury, and in the most shameless Erastianism. Such as was its beginning seems on the whole to have been its course. I am, of course, not denying that it has given birth to eminently holy men, but speaking of its course as a whole, as acting externally, it has from first to last acted with the Protestant body against the Catholic all over Europe; in other words, encouraged schismatics in their rebellion against the Church throughout Western Christendom."

He proceeds to illustrate this, and then sums up the contrast between the shortcomings of the two Churches thus:—

"Her [the Roman Church's] change seems to have been (as it is often expressed) objective, ours (which seems a much more radical change) subjective. With all her corruptions, with all her toleration of a low standard in the mass of men (which I am far from wishing to defend, yet not lower than what we tolerate), she has always held up for the veneration of the faithful the highest standards of holiness; our line has been to sneer at such as popish and fanatical; and what have our authorities done to counteract such a popular view?"

The outcome of this general view of the Anglican establishment is stated in uncompromising terms. He states his belief that her "corruptions and imperfections"—of which he has given, he considers, but an imperfect sketch—"are felt by a not inconsiderable number of persons to such an extent, that but for their confidence in Newman, they could not believe the English Church a true Church at all, and do believe it a most corrupt one. That the Roman corruptions might strike one much more than they do if we lived in the midst of them I can readily believe; but that I have done any justice to the extent of our own I cannot think."

This attitude towards the Anglican establishment, which had already been exhibited in conversation with Dr. Pusey, had drawn from him a retort which was of a kind least to Mr. Ward's taste. Dr. Pusey treated it as implying that Mr. Ward felt himself to be above the system—that the system was not adequate to the demands of exalted spiritual aspirations. Mr. Ward thus replies:—

"Before ending this part of the subject, I wish to make two observations. (1.) In answer to an observation you made when I called on you, that when any one had acted up to the system of our own Church it was time enough to complain of it, I wish to submit (*a*) that, *e.g.* surely few people acted up to the Jewish law, yet that would not excuse them in Judaising after Christianity was offered them; and so a person painfully conscious of his practice being below the lowest system may have the power of appreciating a higher, and if so may have the duty, were it only for the sake of others, of aiming at its restoration; and (*b*) that in this case, though I am of course far from denying that our condition is most injurious to the spiritual life of the most holy, yet it is also deficient in many points which are especially wanted for the less advanced. The more a person feels his deficiency in the apprehension of unseen things, the more painfully he [feels the want] of so 'consoling and impressive' an image of a visible church, as even Rome displays;

the more difficult he finds his contest with his old nature; the more he regrets that he has not been trained from the first in regular confession; the more he misses the practical rules of conduct in which Roman books of devotion abound, drawn from the stores, which they have retained, of traditional teaching; the more he misses the guidance of a priest carefully educated with a view to the confessional. I most firmly believe, that the great majority of our priests would laugh at, or at least pity, the scrupulousness of a tender conscience. Much more, I think, might be said, but let this suffice in answer to an objection which of course would be especially painful to one's self, and which if allowed to be valid, would make it impossible for a person to take the most legitimate measures towards the restoration of a system which he believes divinely appointed, unless he was prepared to publish his opinion that he had acted fully up to the imperfect one in which he had found himself. (2.) You will see how very much less I have said in my pamphlet than what I firmly believe I might most truly have said; so that I have at least exerted a certain amount of self-control."

And again he says of his general indictment against the English Church in the second pamphlet:—

"You will do me the justice to acknowledge [it] is much below what I have said in this letter, and this again is a good deal below what I really feel, could I draw it out. So far from putting out my pamphlet wantonly and lightly I used to lie awake for hours before it came out, from annoyance at my being the person to say such things, and thinking over what pain they would give many persons. Nay, as my friends know, I was quite unwell with anxiety about it."

His last words on the subject run as follows:—

"I do not know that I have anything more to advert to in your letter. This has already gone out to great length, and I have written *currente calamo*, so that *though I shall read it over before I send it and take good care it does not misrepresent my opinions*, its tone may appear less respectful to yourself than is the undeviating habit of my mind. I have been anxious, in compliance with your wish, to speak as openly as possible, yet I feel how inadequately I have put forth what I wanted. I do not think, to repeat what I have said before, that those who are considered extreme are so much blind to the corruptions of Rome, as awake to what they consider corruptions among ourselves. And I am quite convinced that what I have said on the latter subject, as it is below my convictions, so is also below those of several whom I know. I think their great bond of union is entire confidence in Newman, and that it is very improbable

that any (with perhaps one or two exceptions) will change their position, unless he should by any new phenomena be induced to lead the way. For my own part I can only repeat that I should retain no impressions on such subjects which I believed him to disapprove, and that therefore there is at least one existing check against extravagance and unreal talk."

# CHAPTER IX

## EVENTS SUCCEEDING TRACT 90

### 1841-1842

THE proceedings against Tract 90 marked an epoch in the Movement. It was never again what it had been. The attitude of the Heads of Houses was one of open hostility and persecution; and the attitude of the Bishops, though less pronounced, was similar in character. Up to this time the Movement had not looked beyond the Church of England. Her authority had been regarded as final, her formularies as placing an unquestioned limit to speculation. But the action of the authorities changed all this. While the more moderate party sorrowfully acquiesced in defeat, the more extreme grew indignant and rebellious.

Mr. J. A. Froude [1] speaks of the changed state of things as follows: "Hitherto the Tracts had represented pretty exactly Anglican Oxford. Though dangerously clever and more dangerously good, they had never broken bounds, and the unenthusiastic authorities had found themselves unable to do more than warn and affect to moderate. . . . Rome was never spoken of as the probable goal of any but a few foolish young men, whose presence would be injurious to any cause, and who were therefore better in the enemy's camp than at home, and no worldly interests had yet been threatened with damage, except perhaps the Friday dinner, and the Lent second course." But after Tract 90 all this was changed. An informal inquisition was established, and clerical and academical preferment became dependent on a disavowal of the opinions

[1] *Nemesis of Faith*, 137-8.

expressed in the Tracts. "It became necessary to surrender tutorships, fellowships, and the hopes of them; to find difficulties in getting ordained, to lose slowly the prospects of pleasant curacies and livings, and parsonage houses, and the sweet little visions of home paradises, a serious thing to young High Churchmen, who were commonly of the amiable enthusiastic sort, and so, of course, had fallen, most of them, into early engagements . . . and from this time the leader's followers began to lag behind. 'They turned back, and walked no more after him.'"

And naturally those who did proceed in their course, undeterred by persecution, became more uncompromising in their advocacy of opinions, for which they were prepared to endure whatever sacrifice might be called for.

So far as Mr. Ward was concerned the effect was quickly made manifest. Tract 90 had been designed to bind him and his party closer to the English Church, to enable them with a free conscience to work within that Church in accordance with their views of the natural and fitting character of the Church of Christ. The dream of reunion was countenanced by its theory with respect alike to England and to Rome, but rather as a dream than as a practical prospect. If the Tract was admitted by the Church, the dissatisfaction of the extreme party must be lessened. They had an acknowledged place and work within the Church of England, on its principles, and had no reason to look beyond her boundaries. The actual result, however, the reassertion of the Protestant character of Anglicanism, naturally led to an exactly opposite effect.[1] Discontent with the existing state of things was accentuated; and for the first time members of the party began to look directly to Roman Catholics and foreign Churches for the sympathy which was denied them at home.

The Tract had not been censured many weeks before Catholic circles on the continent were aroused by a letter, addressed originally to the *Univers*, and afterwards circulated in Catholic Germany and Italy, written on Passion Sunday, dated from Oxford, and subscribed by an anonymous signature,

[1] This was as Mr. Newman perceived when he wrote (October 1841), "[The Tracts] may become just as powerful for Rome if our Church refuses them, as they would be for our Church if she accepted them."

describing the Catholic leanings of Mr. Newman and his followers, and appealing to the sympathy and co-operation of the foreign churches in the work of reunion. Mr. David Lewis, an active member of the party, thus describes its authorship: "The then much talked of letter to the *Univers* was [Ward's] work, done into French by Father Dalgairns (then a member of Exeter College) whose knowledge of French was greater than that possessed by most of us. . . . The letter was in a certain sense written conjointly; that is, Father Dalgairns spoke and wrote French 'like a native' as people say, being a Guernsey man. But the original conception or idea of writing came from your father, and the substance of the letter was his, the words of course being furnished by Father Dalgairns. . . . The letter was in some degree of a character more Roman than were the opinions of Father Dalgairns at that time." The letter was written in the hortatory style common to French compositions of a similar description. It began by referring to the Anglican Church as "that afflicted Church which has drunk to the dregs the bitter cup which is now the lot of all the Churches of Christ." "The eyes of all Christendom," it declared, "are at this moment turned to England, so long separated from the rest of Catholic Europe. Everywhere a presentiment is gone abroad that the hour of her reunion is at hand, and that this island, of old so fruitful in saints, is once more about to put forth fruits worthy of the martyrs who have watered it with their blood. And truly that this presentiment is not unfounded I shall prove to you by a detail of what is now passing in the University of Oxford, the heart of the Anglican Church." The letter proceeds to give an account of Tract 90 and the events succeeding it. "The author of the Tract," it says, "looks upon the Thirty-Nine Articles as a burden which God in His anger has placed upon us for the sins of our ancestors." "You see then," it continues, "that humility, the first condition of every sound reform, is not wanting in us. We are little satisfied with our position; we groan at the sins committed by our ancestors in separating from the Catholic world. We experience a burning desire to be reunited with our brethren. We love with unfeigned affection the Apostolic see, which we acknowledge to be the head of Christendom;

and the more because the Church of Rome is our mother, which sent from her bosom the blessed St. Augustine to bring us her immovable faith."

It proceeds to vindicate for the English Church the Apostolical succession, and to dwell on Roman practical corruptions, the removal of which is maintained to be indispensable if Anglicanism is to unite itself with Rome. The papacy it holds to be an accidental, the episcopal succession the essential form of a church. It deprecates likewise the political alliance of members of the Roman Church in England with Methodists, Quakers, Independents, and even Socinians, and concludes with the following exhortation to Catholics both in England and abroad:—

"Let the Roman Catholics in England labour to reform themselves; let them break the bands of worldly policy which unite them to our schismatics; let them cease to favour sedition and treason. These are not the arms of the Church. No; she has vanquished the world by her sufferings, fastings, and prayers. We are told that two orders of monks are just established in England to labour at our conversion. Let them, I beseech you, leave to God the care of touching our hearts; let them abstain from those unfortunate efforts which have been made against the peace of our flocks; let them avoid all endeavour to gain over individuals. It is a long task to gather up a nation bit by bit, atom by atom. I aim at pointing out to them the means of harvesting the whole realm, and heaping up its fruits in the granaries of the Church. Let them labour among the Roman Catholics; let them show us what we have not, the image of a Church perfect in discipline and in morals; let her be chaste and beautiful as becomes the divine spouse of Jesus Christ; let her chaunt night and day the praises of her Saviour; and let even her outward garments be glorious, that the spectator, struck with admiration, may throw himself at her feet, seeing clearly in her the well-beloved of the King of Heaven. Let them go into our great towns to preach the Gospel to the half pagan populace; let them walk barefooted, let them be clothed in sackcloth; let them carry mortification written on their brow; let them, in fine, have amongst them a saint like the seraph of Assissium, and the heart of England is already gained.

"And this great heart once so Catholic, this poor heart so long torn by the vigour of its own life (*dechiré par la vigueur de sa propre vie*), exhausted in vain efforts to fill up the frightful void which reigns there, does it not merit some sacrifices on your part, that it may find consolation and healing? Oh, how sweet it was for us to learn that our Catholic brethren prayed for us. The triumphant army in

heaven prays also for us. It has prayed, I am sure, from the beginning of these three centuries of schism and of heresy. Why have not the prayers of St. Gregory, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas been heard? Because of our sins—the sins not only of England but of Rome. Let us go and do penance together, and we shall be heard. During this holy time in which the Church retires to the depths of the solitude of her soul, following the bleeding feet of her Divine Master, driven by the spirit into the desert, know that many of us stretch out our hands day and night before the Lord, and beg of Him, with sighs and groans, to reunite us to our Catholic brethren. Frenchmen, fail not to aid us in this holy exercise, and I am persuaded that many Lents will not have passed before we shall chaunt together our Pascal hymns, in those sublime accents which have been used by the Divine spouse of Christ for so many ages."[1]

This letter caused much excitement both at home and abroad, and an adherent of the more moderate section of the party, Mr. Hamilton Gray, a clergyman then resident at Carlsbad, addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Erlau repudiating the sentiments of the writer, and expressing a doubt as to his being in reality a member of the Oxford party. Mr. Gray maintained that it was written either by a Low Church Protestant, or by a Roman Catholic who for his own purposes misrepresented the views current at Oxford.[2] He denied that the school of Newman wished for any scheme of reunion until Rome had greatly changed, and unless she renounced the doctrine of Papal supremacy. Mr. Gray's letter was published in the *Univers*, and the writer of the original letter replied to it. He had no difficulty in proving himself to be, as he professed, an Oxford student. He hailed Mr. Gray's letter as an additional augury for good. "If [his] opinions," he wrote, "are those of the more moderate of the Catholic party, it will be easily believed that those of which I am the

[1] The translation here quoted from appeared in the English Catholic organ of those days, *The Orthodox Journal*.

[2] "John Hamilton Gray," writes Dr. Bloxam, "had been a gentleman commoner of my College (Magdalene) as early as 1818, and I have before me an account of himself written by himself for my register of the non-foundationers of Magdalene College. He was a fine handsome-looking man, with fair means—travelled a good deal abroad, and was admitted into the best society, especially that of the higher class of ecclesiastics. He was well known to Cardinal Wiseman and also to our Anglican Archbishop (Howley)." Archbishop Pyrker of Erlau, in Hungary, a prelate of great sanctity and talent, made Mr. Gray's acquaintance at Carlsbad in 1841.

organ are maintained by the more advanced of the party. If Mr. H. Gray's letter had appeared five or six years ago it would have been disbelieved by many." The English "Roman" Catholic organ, *The Orthodox Journal*, took the matter up, and there were leading articles on the subject in the *Univers* and in German Catholic papers. No official notice was taken by the University authorities of an anonymous letter; but the fact remained that its sentiments were not disclaimed by the representatives of the "extreme" party, and a programme far more bold and outspoken than anything in Tract 90 was thus practically known to be in contemplation for moving the Anglican Church in a Romeward direction.

Early in the same year in which communication was thus opened with Catholics abroad, circumstances brought the Oxford school into connection with members of the Catholic Church in England. Mr. A. L. Phillipps of Grace Dieu Manor in Leicestershire, a Cambridge man who had joined the Catholic Church in early years,—a man of great piety and zeal,—formed an accidental acquaintance with Bloxam of Magdalene. The merest chance—a carriage accident in a Leicestershire lane—brought them together, and Mr. Phillipps discovered in the course of conversation that he was speaking to a member of the party at Oxford in which he had taken a lively interest. A friendship was struck up, and Mr. Bloxam invited him to Oxford. Here he met Mr. Ward. Zeal for the reunion of Churches was on both sides a bond of sympathy, and the two men sat up half the night on their first introduction discussing the prospects of Christendom. Mr. Ward was invited to meet a party of Catholics at Grace Dieu, to visit Oscott, and to see the Cistercian Monastery of Mount St. Bernard's. Informal communications were also opened with Bishop Wiseman. The conditions for reunion were discussed. The schemes proposed were Utopian, and many who were eager for them have in the event remained staunch Anglicans. But they were a witness to the irritation caused by the action of the Heads and Bishops, and to its tendency to drive men towards Rome. Mr. Ward himself, while deeply interested in the subject, was persistent in his opposition to any sudden step, and for a time at least urged that members of both Churches should confine their energies to the reform of the abuses which disfigured each.

That this feeling, however, was mainly grounded on his confidence in Newman appears from the letters to Mr. Phillipps given below. It will be seen from one of them that he was prepared for a Romeward movement in company with his leader, and had at one time contemplated it, under a mistaken impression that Newman looked upon such a step as immediately practicable. Mr. Phillipps had urged that the Fathers of Charity, the order of the great Italian reformer Antonio Rosmini, then represented in England by the excellent and pious Father Gentili, should open their order at once to the Oxford school, and adapt its rules to their position and antecedents. The scheme, however, resulted only in opportunities for cordial meetings between the Oxonians and the friends of Mr. Phillipps and Father Gentili. The idea itself met with no encouragement from Newman or from responsible members of the party.

Still more urgent were the heads of the party against the movement of individuals. The hope seems still to have been entertained that corporate reunion might be later effected; and until this was abandoned the only feasible course was to act in concert. This state of things continued in full force up to about 1843, as we shall see later on.

Mr. Ward paid two visits to the well-known Catholic College at Oscott. The first was in company with Oakeley on 28th July 1841.[1] The impressions produced by it are thus recorded in a letter from Dr. Bloxam to Mr. Phillipps:—

"Oakeley and Ward both concur with me in expressions of delight at the truly Catholic ἦθος of St. Mary's College, Oscott. Ward wishes to see the place again when the boys are there, and if you allow, will drop in on you by the way. If you and your friends at Oscott are now plagued with Oxford spies you must throw the blame on me, as my description has excited the curiosity of many. Ward was especially pleased with Mr. Logan, which I am not surprised at."

The second visit to Oscott was on occasion of his first visit to Mr. Phillipps at Grace Dieu. Here the Catholic liturgy—carried out as it was very fully and carefully—and the sight, too, of the ascetic life of the monks at Mount St. Bernard's made a great impression on Ward. The monastic habits were a practical illus-

[1] "Oakeley and Ward go down to-morrow to see St. Chad's and Oscott. Mr. Hardman has politely offered to show them whatever they may be allowed to see." (Extract from a letter dated 27th July, from J. R. Bloxam to A. L. Phillipps.)

tration of the "interior life" which he had studied in Rodriguez and St. Ignatius. Tennyson tells us that "things seen are mightier than things heard," and he returned to Oxford more Roman than ever. He begins a letter to Mr. Phillipps soon after his visit as follows:—"I cannot help beginning by the expression of my very great obligation to you for your thoughtful kindness during the week I was with you, and the gratitude I must ever feel to you for having procured me the happiest week, I may almost say, I ever spent."

Mr. Bloxam again chronicles the effect of his visit to Oscott in a letter to Mr. Phillipps, dated 12th October 1841:—

"Ward, who only arrived yesterday, came in to me about ten o'clock last night, and we had a long talk together. He seems to have been even more delighted with his visit to Oscott, etc., than myself, if that were possible. I cannot, of course, tell you all that he said, but as I anticipated, he came away deeply impressed."

Mr. Ward himself has referred to his impressions of Oscott in the *Ideal of a Christian Church*. The questions connected with the moral and religious training of boys had long, as we have seen, been supremely interesting to him; and its very imperfect character in the great public schools, excepting in the case of Arnold's Rugby, was a matter on which he felt very strongly. The regular discipline of a Catholic college, and the constant recognition of the supernatural world in all duties and occupations throughout the day, were most refreshing to him. After drawing a disparaging picture of the average Protestant public school in this respect, he continues:—

"Consider as a contrast to this some particulars in the plan pursued at St. Mary's, Oscott, which I the rather mention because I may add from my own personal observation . . . that a more lively and joyous assemblage of boys and young men, with greater appearance of youthful happiness and buoyancy, and more complete absence of the most distant approach to gloom or restraint of manner, I can never expect to behold. All, at a fixed time in each evening, perform their examen of conscience. All above the age of seven go regularly to confession, few I believe less frequently than once in a fortnight, insomuch that the routine of study is altogether interfered with on the Saturday that time may be given for this holy exercise. Every time they go into the public study or into a class, a prayer with *Veni sancte spiritus*, etc., is recited by the person on duty or the Professor, so that every new act of study is commenced by

prayer. At the three different times in the day when the 'Angelus' sounds the appropriate prayer is recited; if it be in recreation time play is for a few minutes suspended. In the course of every day all attend mass, hear a chapter of the New Testament, a visit is made to the Blessed Sacrament with an appropriate prayer, and part of some spiritual work is read and explained if necessary by each master to his class."

In the midst of these communications with English Catholics came Mr. Sibthorp's conversion;—the first plain example which opponents could point to of positively "Romish" fruits of the Movement. Mr. Phillipps was about to start for Oxford, for further discussion of his favourite scheme, but the excitement at the University was naturally great, and as it seemed undesirable to receive Catholics at such a moment, the visit was postponed. The details of Mr. Sibthorp's change of position, to which Mr. Ward refers later in his letters, are given to me by Dr. Bloxam in the following terms:—

"Sibthorp was a special friend of mine. He had been gradually rising from a low church state, and was developing in his chapel at Ryde. About the middle of October 1841 he came suddenly to me at Magdalene College, of which he was himself a Fellow, and asked me to write to Bishop Wiseman to give him an audience at Oscott, since he wished to consult him about a member of his congregation who had just been, or was about to be, a convert to the Church of Rome. The Bishop replied and appointed a day, which was probably the 23d October, or thereabouts. Sibthorp returned to me in a few days, having been himself received at Oscott. This was the first secession of that time, and made a great sensation. Newman always thought that a man ought to take two years in considering such a step before he took it, and was consequently much disgusted at Sibthorp not taking more than two days. For he certainly went to Oscott without the slightest intention of doing so. Newman was coming to call upon me, and met him in the cloister of Magdalene College. Sibthorp said, 'I am going to Oscott.' Newman replied, 'Take care they do not keep you there.' When Sibthorp came back to Oxford Newman called on me, and warned me against monkeys who had lost their tails and wished every one to lose theirs. He always said that Sibthorp went over on Wesleyan principles. . . . The conversion made me very sad, for it checked at once the correspondence between me and A. Phillipps on the reunion of Churches, which was thus rendered, as I thought, impossible; and when A. Phillipps proposed to pay me a visit on the 9th November following, when the sensation was at its height, I thought the visit ill-timed and probably did not encourage it."

Mr. Sibthorp came back to the Anglican Church within two years, and a fresh argument was supplied against any precipitate movement towards Rome.

The following letters, written by Mr. Ward in the course of the years 1841-1843, give an indication of the state of things at Oxford during those years, and of his own frame of mind.

The first was written to Bloxam within a month of the appearance of Tract 90, on the first intimation of Mr. Phillipps' views and wishes with respect to reunion.

"VIGIL OF THE ANNUNCIATION, 1841.

"MY DEAR BLOXAM,—I am very much delighted with Mr. Phillipps' letters which you have kindly shown me, and cannot resist saying a few words to convey to him how deeply I sympathise with his generous Christian wishes for our Church. For my own part, I believe it is hardly beyond the truth to say that some of my strongest religious impressions were derived from the Roman Catholic services in London, which I used frequently to attend; and the restoration of active communion with that Church is the most enchanting earthly prospect on which my imagination can dwell. Would that the time for that reunion were as near as Mr. Phillipps in his earnest wish for it considers it to be. But so much at least is plain, that while good is mutually attractive, evil is mutually repulsive; and so long (alas, that it must be said) as the governing spirit in both Churches is carnal and political, seeking objects of this earth, as Churches they must remain estranged from each other as at present. Nor should it be taken to show that many of us here are less earnestly anxious for the great consummation than Mr. Phillipps himself, that they are less sanguine as to its immediate accomplishment, and desirous to put off for the present any direct step towards it. For, not to dwell on the far greater experience which we have than Mr. Phillipps can have of the obstacles arising from the general feeling in our own body, there is this great difference between us, that while we feel deeply how much of Christian privilege we lose by our state of isolation, we humbly trust we are not by it altogether cut off in the sight of God from communion with the mystical body of Christ (see Newman's article in *British Critic* on the 'Catholicity of the English Church'), while he seems on the whole to think (I suppose it almost necessarily follows from his position that he *should* think) that we are; so that his kind interest in our welfare will, of course, lead him to be more comparatively anxious than we should be for a speedy rather than a complete and healthy reunion. In the meantime we owe a debt of gratitude more than can be expressed to those our Christian brethren who, as Mr. Phillipps mentions, are engaged in so many

places in constant prayer for the restoration of Catholic unity in England: may our prayers be joined with theirs, and God in his good time bring about what He alone can do whose strength is made perfect in our weakness.—Ever, my dear Bloxam, yours most sincerely, W. G. WARD."

Next comes a letter written to Mr. Phillipps in October 1841—not long after Mr. Ward's visit to Grace Dieu—with reference to one of the schemes which had been suggested to help the cause of reunion. The scheme had apparently been discussed with Bishop Wiseman.

"*October* 28, 1841.

". . . With regard to the earlier part of your letter, you may perhaps have understood from Bishop Wiseman that we all (naturally enough, as he acknowledges) misunderstood part of Newman's letter, and imagined him to have put the case of his own coming over with others much more positively than he ever intended to put it. His feeling on the subject seems to be, or rather certainly is, that we ought hardly to look forward beyond the present hour, but wait in quietness and obedience for plainer indications of God's will concerning us; that we have hitherto been so singularly guided and protected, things have so baffled in their issues all human calculation, that any more self-willed course of conduct may forfeit to any extent the blessings which we humbly hope are in store for us. The message might come to us any day which would warn us to change our position; it may be a duty for many years to remain as we are: but what he wished to urge upon Mr. Spencer[1] was this,—that whatever became of individuals, the English Church could never be conciliated except by a certain course of conduct. All this being so, your kind communication about the order of charity is of less certain and immediate importance than it otherwise might be; though of course it might become of the most pressing interest any single day. Still I trust it may be said that on the whole your and my own final object are the same: you cannot be more anxious than I am for the return of the greatest possible number of Englishmen *in the most Catholic and Christian temper possible* to visible unity; I should perhaps be hardly more anxious than you that many things which we consider corruptions in the foreign churches should be amended or at least protested against. Considering ourselves then as embarked on the whole in a common cause, would you kindly look upon anything I say as suggestions to one on the same side for promoting the common object, rather than as complaints or recriminations against an opponent. From our position we must see many things much more clearly than yourselves with regard to your prospects of success in England; just as you see better than we the

[1] Father Ignatius Spencer, the celebrated Passionist.

practical working of your system abroad. What I have to say in answer to your kind criticism on my article will come in better after I have said the rest of my say. I will only now protest against the idea that I can be offended by the most free remarks upon it. *Hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim*, there is no hope of getting on unless we use the greatest freedom in our communications; and I hope in this letter myself to exercise the same licence.

"On the subject of the order of charity you have not entered explicitly into what seems to me the most important part of the matter. The chief thing I was anxious to ascertain was, how far it could go avowedly upon the principle of especial *cultc* of the Fathers, or again of making our Lord the prominent object of teaching more than seems at present usually the case in your communion: using, for instance, the crucifix and other such external symbols rather than images of B.V.M., etc. I am not speaking of any of this as essential; nay, as far as my argument is concerned, not as in itself desirable; but I am saying that you can have no idea of the effect it would have on the minds of many of us, were it possible that such a bond of union could be put prominently forward by a religious body acting under the Pope. Nothing can be more beautiful, edifying, and unexceptionable than the *Maxims of Christian Perfection* by Rosmini, which Dr. Gentili was kind enough to give me; but then, on the other hand, Dr. Gentili himself, who is one of the order, is, as you told me yourself, far from patristically inclined, being in fact more modern and Roman, I suppose, than the average of your priests. You know too well my deep veneration for him to imagine that I say this disparagingly: I merely mention it as an adverse phenomenon as regards this order. But speaking in general, the more you can, after mature deliberation and with high sanction, offer Newman and others a refuge where they would be protected and countenanced in their feeling upon such points as I spoke at length about to yourself and Bishop Wiseman, so much the more by a great deal will be your chance of giving Newman, should he come to you, a large following; and also so much the more will you save his reputation among those who remain behind, by giving him the power of saying: 'I protested against Rome on account of certain doctrines she practically professes; behold, in going over, I have a public protection against being expected to profess such doctrines.' This is the sort of consideration I wished you kindly to enter upon and send the result in writing of your mature thoughts: perhaps you might still be kind enough to bear it in mind, for I am sure it is hardly possible to overrate its importance."

The letter was continued after Mr. Sibthorp's conversion:—

"*Tuesday.*

"I am quite ashamed of having put off so long my continuation of this letter, but must trust to your kindness to pardon me. I

have had a good many interruptions of one kind or another. In the meantime we have heard of Mr. Sibthorp's change of position, and are very anxious about what the effect may be as soon as it is generally known. In the meantime I hope you will not think us very rude, but Bloxam is particularly anxious that you should fix some other time for coming to Oxford; for it will be for all of us a most difficult matter to arrange while this news of Mr. Sibthorp is fresh. Especially as Bloxam would entertain you at Magdalene, and as that is also Mr. Sibthorp's college, the Fellows there might very much dislike Bloxam having so soon a Roman Catholic friend with him; or might indeed imagine that he was to go next. I spoke to Mr. S. on Saturday on what seems to Newman a particularly important subject, and which I will now go on to mention to you. Very often one gets impressions at a particular time which are vague and floating, and which afterwards one reduces into shape and consistency. This is my case with regard to what I felt both with you and at Oscott in one particular. I felt somehow that our way of looking at the progress of things within our Church was so different. I have been thinking it over a good deal since, and I will try to express it in a few words; which you will not, of course, regard as intended in attack of you, but rather looking upon you and us as fellow-workers in the same holy cause. We are very anxious both to give and receive suggestions as to matters of fact which on both sides from our position we may mistake. You did not, then, seem to me any of you to feel the dreadful amount of laxity and practical (almost) antinomianism which had pervaded the English Church, and still is lamentably prevalent within it; nor did you accordingly seem aware of the inestimable value of the services of Dr. Pusey and others, in infusing so widely an opposite spirit. It is very natural, of course, that you should not at all know this, yet it is not the less lamentable. Orthodox doctrine on every point is, I suppose, particularly brought out in places where heresy on those points is most prevalent; and accordingly English High Churchmen are perhaps more sensitive than almost any other Catholics as to the fact that self-denial and obedience to God's will are the appointed methods for individuals to arrive at true doctrine. Now I conceive that your Church, claiming to be the Catholic Church in England, should assume this position, that wherever are found strictness and purity of life, anxious conscientiousness, etc., there are her friends. These qualities and the persons possessed of them really belong to her, and should be looked on as secret fellow-workers with her. To be anxious for individuals to join her by short cuts (if I may use such an expression) is to take up a sectarian position, and seem rather to think of the temporal welfare of the Roman Church than of promoting God's glory as He would have it. In proportion, on the one hand, as the Roman Church displays herself in her true

colours as the visible image of sanctity and purity, and in proportion, on the other, as individuals advance in obedience and the spiritual life, in that proportion (if she be the Catholic Church) will they recognise her claims and join her, not from sudden impulse, but from the deliberate adhesion of their whole nature. I remember in our journey to Oscott I was rather scandalised at your approval of persons joining you from æsthetical considerations. I retract my disapproval of that sentiment, and acknowledge that persons may be brought through that to higher things. Still, the appointed and legitimate mode of arriving at truth is surely the one I have described. The scholastic doctrine of 'congruity' is precisely in point. Believing yourselves, then, to be the true Church, in consistency you must believe that the spirit working at present within the English Church is certain in God's good time to bring His elect to you, however much they may now blasphemously slander you: and it is, therefore, much more for God's final glory that you sympathise with and pray for those who through the English Church are preaching the true doctrine of the Cross, obedience and self-denial, to the overthrow of Lutheran heresy, than that you should show anxiety for the immediate union of some few individuals.

"Now there are persons in our Church (I may take I. Williams, who wrote the work on the Passion which you admired so much as one remarkable instance, but I could name many such), who are models of primitive piety, simplicity, devotion and self-sacrifice; who from their very feeling of reverence for what they have been taught, are sadly mistaken as to your real character. Some of them even use against you most harsh and bitter language, not realising what they say, but using words they have been taught and accustomed to use. Yet you should, as I would venture to urge, look upon these men as really in God's sight as much as any men fellow-workers with you; for they are fostering and inculcating those very habits which, if you are the Church, are sure to lead men to you. Yet it seemed to me that those of you whom I heard speak had hardly more sympathy with such men than with raging 'Evangelicals.' Let me again repeat, I am not speaking as if you were to blame in this. It is our misfortune on both sides to know so little of each other; but it is much to be lamented. And mark the effect on the other side; these excellent persons I speak of are confirmed in their rejection of your claims by observing how comparatively little strictness as such is sympathised with by you, and claimed as on your own side; and out of (what even you consider) the whole Catholic system how little is fully appreciated by you when exhibited, except that part peculiar to yourselves. I don't know whether I make myself at all plain; I shall try to put it out a good deal more at length in an article I am writing for the *British Critic*, and which may possibly appear in January. Accordingly I shall

be glad to hear from you in time, both whether you understand what I mean, and also whether by chance my impression is erroneous as to your general feeling. I have been myself a good deal shocked by finding in an interview with I. Williams how very strongly he felt against you; and am therefore the more anxious that you should at least know what a difficulty is thrown in the way of our common hopes by whatever may even seem to mark your communion as leavened with a Protestant, or sectarian, or worldly character. In a word, in return for your charging me with Protestantism, I charge you with implicit and unconscious Lutheranism: no sympathy is felt for the inculcation of habits of self-denial and scrupulous obedience till they are developed into veneration of saints and love of ceremonial. I send you the books you wished to have. I should like you to begin by reading the twelfth, twenty-second, and twenty-third sermons of Newman's fourth volume. You will observe that his first volume is a good deal less glowing and affectionate than the others; and both in the first and second you will see the hateful nature of the heretical feeling which he had chiefly to oppose. In his work on 'Justification' you must remember that by the 'Roman' view he means not the 'Tridentine' decrees, but those decrees as commented on by Bellarmine and his school; he considers his own views to be almost identical with those of St. Thomas. You must also remember that he was obliged, in order to get a hearing, to say all he honestly could against Rome.

"The ninth, tenth, and eighteenth of the third volume will also please you. I should very much like Bishop Wiseman, and any other person at Oscott who is interested in the matter, to read any of the sermons you would recommend; also if this letter is not very stupid and unintelligible (which I very much fear it is) I should rather like you, if you happen to see the Bishop, to read the latter part of it to him. Apologising again for having kept you so long without an answer, and begging my kind regards to Mrs. A. Phillipps, believe me, yours very sincerely, W. G. WARD."

Letter from W. G. WARD to A. L. PHILLIPPS.

"IN 'OCTAVA' S.S. INNOCENTIUM, 1842.

"I am ashamed of having left you so long without a full answer to your letter, for which I am much obliged. You must, I fear, make up your mind to find me a bad correspondent, as all my friends do; and I have felt in addition that I had so much to say that I was afraid of beginning. I am glad you sent for Palmer's letter; though there are one or two things in it you will not like. The most important part of his case is that he is not a follower of Newman at all, but of an altogether distinct school, which makes it more cheering and hopeful to find how much truth he has attained. What will be the issue of our present excitement it is impossible to

guess; perhaps the most ominous thing we have yet seen is the Archbishop of Canterbury's answer to the address of the Cheltenham laymen. Considering his proverbial caution it looks as if something serious were really meditated against us. On the other hand, one cannot expect that your own members will not be anxious for a speedy reunion of forces; and of course if it be a duty (in your opinion) to join, nothing more can be said. But as a question of expediency, I am far more convinced than when with you that our best hope by far is to stay and work in our respective churches. The signs on many sides of our own members becoming more Catholic are more in number and in promise than you probably imagine; and if this clamour would only subside, and leave people in quiet to carry out to their consequences the doctrines they profess to hold, the most happy results must follow. But it seems daily more uncertain whether this opportunity will be given. Newman has been preaching some most striking sermons during Advent on the notes of the Church, and the duty of staying where we are. I think you would have been much pleased, for he neither said nor implied anything whatever against Rome, and spoke of the visible notes of our Church as either gone or fast going. But he said that under our circumstances those who were within our Church ought not to leave her communion so long as they have proof of our Lord's presence with her by their progress in holiness and power of avoiding sin. His argument went to show that even were we in strictness no part of the Church at all, still we should be bound to stay where we are and work towards unity. He instanced Elijah who, though so favoured as to appear with Moses at the transfiguration, yet was never in communion with the centre of unity. Even when Israel was at its worst he did not fulfil the precept of unity; he passed by Jerusalem and went on to Mount Sinai. He threw himself on antiquity. 'We must,' he said, 'remedy the sin of Ahab before we go to remedy the sin of Jeroboam.' In other words, we must make the English Church as a body orthodox in doctrine, that she may be ready healthily to unite with Christendom. I may add to yourself . . . that within the last month he has been favoured with singular intimations of Christ's presence in the sacraments of our Church. He mentioned in his sermons, also, that many death-beds in our Church afford the strongest proof that we are not deserted by Him.

"I have been spending Christmas with Oakeley in London. He has a little room in his house fitted up like a chapel in which he with a few friends daily recites most part of the holy office. On Christmas Eve we had our own service in his public chapel at nine o'clock in the evening, attended by about 150 people, with beautiful music and a very nice short lecture; we then went over to his house and recited vespers and compline. Then to tea, and after

tea the nocturns for Christmas day, so as to begin lauds as nearly as possible at midnight. Next morning at seven he had his boys over, and we opened with the 'Adeste fideles' and his family prayers, which are as nearly as may be translated from Prime. Our own service took up the rest of the day, but in the evening we had again vespers and compline. We have had the whole of some offices for many days, and I can't tell you how delighted I have been. I had no idea before of the exceeding beauty of the Catholic service as a whole, and I hope, if possible, to get up a small sodality on my return to Oxford to join in the same services.

". . . I am anxious to hear your present feelings about our position and prospects. I have found to a greater extent than I anticipated objections to an immediate union with St. Peter's See, even in persons very catholicly disposed; which the more impresses on my mind the great importance (if it be lawful) of remaining in our present position with the hope of 'poisoning' as many as possible."

The next letter refers to an article in the *Dublin Review*, attributed to Mr. Phillipps, upon the Oxford party. The letter was written, apparently, very soon after Mr. Sibthorp's return to the Anglican communion, which fixes the date approximately. Mr. Sibthorp came back in October 1843.

"MY DEAR MR. PHILLIPPS—I cannot forbear from writing to thank you for the extreme kindness of tone displayed towards myself in an article which I understand is yours in the new *Dublin Review*. It will not, I think, serve any good purpose to discuss the points at issue between us; but merely that you may not mistake me, I wish to say that, speaking only for myself, I have a more certain conviction that it is my present duty to stay where I am, than I can possibly have on the subject of the Pope's abstract claims; as in my opinion persons of any seriousness have more means of knowing their own immediate duty than of proving any general principle which does not directly appeal to the conscience. Were you to prove ever so clearly (though of course I am convinced you could not do so) that my opinions on these respective subjects are mutually irreconcilable, you would make me abandon my faith in the Pope, not my conviction of present duty. By this time you have doubtless heard of Mr. Sibthorp's step. How unspeakably dreadful: it makes one sick to think of it. I hear that quite moderate people among ourselves are extremely disgusted. But might I be allowed to observe that you Roman Catholics really don't know what you are doing, when you endeavour to weaken the force of those feelings which restrain people from any change not distinctly placed before them by Providence; and that I for one

should not be altogether surprised at other steps of a similar nature, if you were to succeed in your attempts to make converts in a similar manner. I hope this will not appear unkind, considering how deeply you must feel his miserable procedure; you can hardly be more shocked by it than those are with whom I most agree (I mean such as Oakeley and many others). His reception among us will be, I fully expect, of the most repulsive character; I for one shall decline any intercourse with him whatever. Will you give my kindest remembrances to Mrs. A. Phillipps, and believe me, my dear Mr. Phillipps, very sincerely yours, W. G. WARD.

"I return to Oxford on Thursday."

Meantime Newman was winding up his accounts with the Movement. It was between July and November 1841 that he received the three blows which, as he has told us, "broke him." He set to work at Littlemore at his translation of St. Athanasius, and it came upon him in the course of his work that once more St. Augustine's *securus judicat*, with its ominous condemnation of the Anglican position, was exhibited in the history of the Primitive Church. "The pure Arians were the Protestants, the semi-Arians were the Anglicans, and Rome now was where it was then."[1] Next came the Bishops' charges; one after another condemned Tract 90. At first he thought of protesting. "If the view [advocated by the Tract] were silenced I could not remain in the Church," he wrote, "and therefore since it is not silenced, I shall take care to show that it isn't." But in the end he abandoned the thought of a protest, as he tells us, "in despair." Then came the Jerusalem bishopric, the project on the part of the Archbishop of Canterbury of combining with the Protestant Church of Prussia in the appointment of a Bishop of Jerusalem. This was the last and heaviest of the blows. The English Church was renouncing its claim to be a branch of the Catholic body. It was avowedly acting with Protestants as a Protestant Church. Catholic views, as he said in the protest against the measure which he sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury, "as far as the Church has lately spoken out, are not merely not sanctioned . . . but not even suffered."

His visits to Littlemore became less frequent only because they became longer; and about the end of 1842 he betook himself thither to reside there exclusively. He collected

[1] *Apologia*, p. 139 *seq.*

round him some younger friends and followers, who lived a community life of regular religious observances, and he retired permanently from active leadership. "I had . . . given up the contest . . ." he writes, "and my part in it had passed into the hands of others."[1] For the rest of his time, until he joined the Catholic Church in 1845, he remained, as we see in the *Apologia*, too uncertain either to maintain the Anglican position or to adopt the Roman.

The relations at this time between Newman and Ward were somewhat complex. Ward's loyal devotion to the leader who had first won his allegiance to the Movement was notorious; but it was neither in accordance with his nature, nor with his habits of constant and exhaustive discussion on the great question with all his friends, to remain passive, waiting for Newman's next "move." With the most absolute belief in Newman's power to settle the various difficulties which arose, he constantly referred to him to gain his *imprimatur* for the fresh conclusions or fresh arguments which the day's conversation had brought before him as necessary to their position.

So long as Newman had been quite confident of his ground this was possibly not unacceptable to him, as putting before him questions which were current in the University, and of which he ought to take account in his writings. But as time went on and he felt doubtful of his position, and the heavy responsibility faced him of throwing the weight of his opinion into one scale or another, this constant questioning, as he has plainly intimated in the *Apologia*, annoyed and perplexed him.[2] He could not meet each question to his satisfaction, and yet he felt it unfair and out of accord with his judgment that he should advance at the pace at which Ward's daily logical conclusions called on him to advance. In spite of Ward's loyal devotion, and in spite of the affection which Newman had for those who depended on his daily counsels, there was a difference of method, of temperament, in some sense of aim, which made the two men almost at cross purposes.

Their relations in connection with Tract 90 may perhaps be taken as typical of the general difference between them.

[1] *Apologia*, p. 293.

[2] *Apologia*, p. 164, *seq.* See also *infra*, Appendix F.

Tract 90 had, as we have seen, been suggestive of much more than the actual position it had defended. Those who read between the lines could see in its principles a wider scope of toleration in the direction of Rome, and a more unfavourable view of the Reformers than it plainly advocated. To some extent, perhaps, the views latent in it were *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσι*, and were not more openly expressed because its author might not wish to startle men whose thoughts and difficulties were in other directions, who stood in no need of its suggestions, and who would not understand them. Even as it stood, its allowances in the Roman direction had shocked the prejudices of a large section. It was written, Newman said, for one set of men, and commented on by others. Then again, some of the more extreme Roman conclusions deducible from its principles may not have been contemplated by the writer as conclusions certainly valid. "Sometimes," he says, "in what I wrote I went just as far as I saw, and could as little say more as I could see what is below the horizon; and, therefore, when asked to give the consequences of what I had said I had no answer to give."

But the very points where Newman stopped short were those which Ward, alike from his intellectual temperament and from his position, wished to have explicitly cleared up. When the Tract was sifted and discussed by men of all shades of opinion, what was said by some of its enemies in blame was the very thing which Ward wished to say in praise of it,—that its principles allowed of the holding, consistently with subscription, of all obligatory Roman doctrine. Ward called for a more explicit statement than could be found in it that Trent and the Articles could both be subscribed at once. A position short of this would not defend his own *locus standi;* and when Tait, Stanley, Jowett, and other men of various schools argued the matter out with him, nothing short of the whole logical defence he had worked out for himself was adequate to the discussion. But when, in addition, Newman's reserve, or caution, or imperfect development of his own view, was stigmatised as disingenuousness, there seemed a further reason for facing frankly and fully what the Tract did and what it did not countenance. The utmost directness and openness seemed to him imperative in the whole matter. He expressed

this view, as we have seen, in defending himself to Mr. Scott. "It seems to me," he said, "that some further discussion is necessary under present circumstances. We cannot expect people to receive a view in many respects so strange to them without much difficulty and misgiving; and I feel convinced the more the matter is sifted on both sides in the right spirit the more clearly will truth (on whichever side it be) emerge." And it was this constant sifting, in this case and in others, this working out of each view as it came forward in all its consequences, this refusal to let it grow in silence, or to accept it without comparing it with the views of others, which, when it took the form of pressing Mr. Newman himself for Yes or No in the analysis of his own utterances, became gradually annoying to him. He loved to give his thoughts to the world as a poet does, suggestively, subjectively, informally, incompletely, leaving it for others to learn what they could from him, but disliking and distrusting all pretence of full analysis. But such an indefinite method, with all its charm, from its nature stopped short where discussion, with its necessary element of a common measure for various minds, begins. And so it was insufficient for the requirements of the Balliol common room.

The difference of method is also to a great extent explained by the difference in the aim of the two men. Mr. Newman had to consider, before all things, the effect of his action on a large party which had hitherto acknowledged him as their leader, and which an imprudent step on his part might break up and disorganise. When the Roman question became more and more practical and pressing, he was torn with conflicting attractions and motives. Early memories and associations, the first hopes and aspirations of the Movement, had bound him heart and soul to the Church of England. His attachment to his University, and his love for Pusey and the old Tractarian party, made common cause with this, and held him back from moving in a direction opposed to the deepest feelings he cherished; while his growing intellectual difficulty in the Anglican position, his suspicion that the Romanisers would prove right, and his sympathy with Rome and Christendom, urged him onwards. Yet he has told us that he could not feel sure that the Romeward tendency was not a delusion. And if so, how unpardonable to break up the party by taking

a line which might prove, in the event, to have been mistaken. In view, then, of the weight of his lightest word, and of the intensely critical situation, silence and waiting seemed to be his only course. He did not dare to throw his full weight into either scale, although reluctantly, when pressed, he had perforce to intimate which way his convictions were travelling. But discussions intended to be tentative, and yet in which each provisional conclusion was registered as an *ex Cathedra* utterance, tried him. They committed him prematurely to positions of which he was not certain, and the issues were too far-reaching, and the tension in the public mind was too great, to justify this.

Mr. Ward, on the other hand, had a position of comparative simplicity to maintain. He had no clinging love for the Church of his birth. His love for the persons of the early Tractarians was not a constraining force. He had one, and one only, burning desire, in which feeling and reason alike concurred,—the carrying out of the principles of the great Movement to what he considered their lawful issue. All else was small and insignificant to him compared with this. The English Church was to be restored to its true ideal, and that ideal he soon came to recognise as essentially similar both in doctrine and in discipline to that exhibited by Rome. He had defined his own position and broken with the moderate Tractarians. They were to his mind inconsistent, and failed to carry out their principles. The persons he wished to satisfy were consistent friends and consistent foes; and for these classes the clearest statement of principles and the most direct recognition of objections were called for. His whole mind and heart, then, were intent on clearing the ground and coping with the difficulties which arose, and his trust in Mr. Newman made constant consultation with him inevitable. He was not happy that his solutions were correct until he had Newman's sanction, and Newman went far enough with him, and had sufficient reluctance to express dissent, to satisfy Ward in this respect. When once he had, or considered he had, Newman's sanction on one point, he continued working out further steps and the appeal was repeated. He considered that he was helping the cause of truth by throwing Newman's views and their consequences into definite logical form, by translating them from the language

of suggestion into that of complete categorical statement. This helped to make things clear, to make all parties understand each other, to show to friend and foe alike where they stood. Here again his language in reference to his defence of Tract 90 serves as an illustration. "I have anxiously endeavoured," he wrote, "to make my pamphlet neither indirect, nor satirical, nor ambiguous (charges brought against the Tract). In order to support what Newman conscientiously believed the true view, it was necessary either to hint or openly to state his extremely unfavourable view of the Reformers. From the wish to avoid giving unnecessary offence he chose the former method; for those who misunderstood that, and charged him with disingenuousness where he meant to charge the Reformers with it, I thought a short pamphlet, putting the charges against the Reformers more fully, might be serviceable." He knew that he should annoy Dr. Pusey, whom he revered and loved; he knew that he should tend to break up the party to which he belonged; but here, as ever, he could only say *amicus Plato sed magis amica veritas.* So far as Newman himself was affected, loyalty to friendship and to the truth appeared in this case combined, for he aimed at defending him from the accusations of his opponents.

In this state of things he failed to see that after a time his guide became embarrassed and unwilling to pursue the discussion, as having reached a point where he was unprepared to talk until he had had more time to think. When, years later, the *Apologia* appeared, this came on Ward as a new light. He considered, indeed, that later differences had accentuated the feeling there indicated—had, as it were, led Dr. Newman to look at the past through glasses coloured by more recent events; but nevertheless he was pained at discovering an element in their Oxford relations of which he had been at the time wholly unconscious.

There seems, as I have said, to have been something of cross purposes in all this. Mr. Newman's friends were indignant at their leader's hand being forced, especially those who saw too plainly that the pressure brought to bear on him was hastening him, with whatever reluctance, towards the step which was to separate them from him. They accused Mr. Ward of inconsiderateness, of supposing that logic and dis-

cussion could settle all things, of propounding unreal dilemmas, of ignoring the innumerable considerations which must be taken account of before a conclusion is finally accepted, and which may modify in practice a theoretical conclusion which seems at first sight inevitable. "No one can tell," writes the Dean of St. Paul's, "how much this state of things affected the working of Mr. Newman's mind in the pause of hesitation before the final step; how far it accelerated the ultimate view he took of his position. No one can tell, for many other influences were mixed up with this one. But there is no doubt that Mr. Newman felt the annoyance and the unfairness of this perpetual questioning for the sake of Mr. Ward's theories; and there can be little doubt that in effect it drove him onwards and cut short his time of waiting."

This view of Mr. Ward's attitude was doubtless shared by most of those to whom the Movement was before all things Anglican, and on whom the fear of Newman's separation from the English Church weighed like a nightmare. On the other hand, there were men of various schools of thought, friends of Mr. Ward, whose questions in part led him to urge Newman to greater explicitness, who distrusted Newman's method as so personal as to be prejudiced, so reserved and ambiguous as to give his enemies a plausible excuse for considering him unstraightforward, so subtle in distinctions, and in explanations so nearly explaining away, as to account for—if not to excuse—the term Jesuitical used of him by men of plainer minds. He seemed so distrustful of dialectics and discussion as to ignore dilemmas arising from his own words which called aloud for an answer; so hopeless of making those whose principles differed widely from his own understand him, and so unwilling to consider them, as to provoke the charge of narrowness and over-great subjectivity. Mr. Ward's reverence for Newman was too great to allow him to entertain such charges, but he saw that they needed an answer, and this was an additional reason for wishing to draw from Newman plainer and fuller statements. Many openly expressed the view in question. We have seen this already in the case of Mr. Tait and Mr. Wilson in connection with Tract 90. Dean Stanley, looking back at those days a year before his death, gives expression in some measure to a similar feeling. "We must admit," he writes, "that there

was a tortuous mode of pursuing his purposes which, though consistent with absolute sincerity, may naturally have given birth at the time to some sinister suspicions. It was owing, no doubt, in part to the difficulty of his position, constantly shifting under him, that Dr. Newman had recourse to the practice of whispering, like the slave of Midas, his secret into the reeds, in the hope that some future traveller might peradventure discover it."

Cardinal Newman has told us that Dr. Pusey was very slow to believe whither he was going, and we see in the *Apologia* traces of the same conflict between affection and reason, in his attitude towards Pusey on the one hand, and the "extreme" party on the other, as between the claims of the English and Roman Churches on his allegiance.

In 1842 Pusey asked him point blank whether he went entirely with Ward, and Newman's answer was as follows:—

"As to my being entirely with Ward, I do not know the limits of my own opinions. If Ward says that this or that is a development from what I have said, I cannot say Yes or No. It is plausible, it may be true. Of course the fact that the Roman Church has so developed and maintained adds great weight to the antecedent plausibility. I cannot assert that it is not true; but I cannot, with that keen perception which some people have, appropriate it. It is a nuisance to me to be *forced* beyond what I can fairly accept."

On the other hand, when his University sermons came out in 1843, at a time when Mr. Ward had been publishing, anonymously, a series of articles in the *British Critic* in which his Roman views were most openly expressed, Mr. Newman appended the following note to his sermon on "Love, the safeguard of Faith against Superstition"—the only personal reference in the volume:—

"Some admirable articles have appeared in the late numbers of the *British Critic* on the divinely appointed mode of seeking truth where persons are in doubt and difficulty [references are here given to five different articles by Mr. Ward]. As they appear to be only the first sketches of a deep and important theory which has possession of the writer's mind, it is to be hoped that they will one day appear in a more systematic form."

The following reminiscences of those days by Father Lockhart, one of Newman's companions at Littlemore, and now Superior of the English Rosminians, throws a very curious

light on Newman's relations with Dr. Pusey on the one hand, and with Mr. Ward on the other:—

"When I had been a very few weeks at Littlemore," Father Lockhart writes, "I found my doubts about the claims of the Church of England becoming so strong that I told 'Newman' that I did not see how I could go on. I doubted the orders, and still more the jurisdiction of the Church of England, and could feel no certainty of absolution. If I remember clearly I said to Newman, 'But are you sure you can give absolution?' To which I think his reply was, 'Why do you ask me? ask Pusey.' He came to me a little later and said, 'I see you are in such a state that your being here would not fulfil the end of the place. You must agree to stay here three years, or go at once.' I said, 'I do not see how I can promise to stay three years. Unless I am convinced that I am safe in staying I cannot do it. And if I went I do not feel that I know enough to make my submission to Rome, when so many better and more learned men do not see their way to do so.' He said, 'Will you go and have a talk with Ward?' I assented, and I think the next day I had a talk for three hours round and round the Parks. In the end I felt unconvinced and mystified. Yet one thing your father put very strongly to me, that I knew enough of myself to know that I ought to distrust my own judgment; that I knew little of religion and practised less,—in fact that my conscience was not in such a state that I could have any confidence that my intellect would not be warped in any judgment so momentous, involving all manner of moral and intellectual questions, etc. He had just brought out [some articles in the *British Critic*] in which . . . he lays great stress on the necessity of conscience being clear in order to a right intellectual judgment on religious questions. In the end I went back to Newman and told him (as I learned afterwards to his surprise) that I had made up my mind to stay three years before taking any step Romewards.

"I meant it, but I could not stay more than a year. What brought matters to a crisis was my meeting Father Gentili at your father's rooms with Mr. and Mrs. de Lisle. When the summer came I went to take my mother and sister into Norfolk, and then to make a short tour to see the places in Lincolnshire connected with the life of St. Gilbert of Sempringham, which I was writing. I thence went to Loughboro, where I saw Father Gentili. He saw I was in a miserable state of perplexed conscience, feeling that nothing bound me back from Rome but my promise to Newman. By his advice I made a three days' retreat, which ended in my making my confession, being received into the Church, and three days after entering as a postulant into Rosmini's order."

# CHAPTER X

## THE ROMEWARD MOVEMENT

### 1842–44

FROM the time when Newman, in 1841, abstained more and more from taking an active share in the Movement, a new character began to be evident in its proceedings. His restraining hand was removed, in great measure, from the "extreme" party, and it at once came more prominently forward, and asserted more uncompromisingly its Roman tendencies. Newman had resigned the editorship of the *British Critic*, which passed into the hands of his brother-in-law Mr. Thomas Mozley. Ward and Oakeley commenced in 1841 a series of articles in its pages, which eventually, as we shall see, brought matters to a crisis. The more moderate Puseyite faction at the same time—such men as Dr. Pusey himself and Mr. Isaac Williams—accentuated their opposition to Rome, and the separation between the two camps became an acknowledged fact. Very soon a distinct change became manifest in the theory which the advanced section advocated with respect to their membership of the Anglican Church, and by the time Newman had permanently retired to Littlemore at the end of 1842, they were maintaining principles which could never secure permanent toleration within the Anglican Establishment. Mr. Ward's own account of this theory shall be given in full later on. Here it is sufficient to call attention to the chief points in which it involved a break with the original Tractarian principles.

In the first place, the question whether the Anglican Church was in any sense a branch of the Church Universal

was answered more and more doubtfully; and it was openly denied to have any of the external notes of a Church. Next the protest against Roman corruptions grew gradually more feeble; Roman doctrine was more and more fully accepted, until in Mr. Ward's work, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, Rome was practically acknowledged as the divinely appointed guardian and teacher of religious truth. Finally, the old idea of working towards the reunion of Churches, and calling for concessions on both sides with a view to this object, disappeared. The Pope was maintained to be normally Primate of Christendom, and the ultimate aim proposed for the English Church was not reunion with but submission to Rome.

On what ground then did the men who held this theory justify their remaining in the Church of England? On the ground (1) that Providence had placed them in it, (2) that its formularies were so loose as to allow the holding of all Roman doctrine within its pale, (3) that the sudden adoption of doctrines new to the moral nature was difficult and undesirable, and that the English Church afforded a good position for gradually drawing nearer to Rome, until some considerable portion of churchmen should have so far imbibed the spirit of Roman Catholicism, as to feel conscientiously impelled to outward conformity to its communion. For an individual to move prematurely might destroy this prospect; and therefore he was to be for the present content with uniting himself in spirit to the Roman Church, without formally joining her. So long as conscience did not clearly call upon him to take the further step, so long might he hope that he was not cut off from grace by remaining where Providence had placed him.

That Newman did not disapprove of this theory in the outset is clear from a letter of his written in September 1843 to Mr. Hope—afterwards Mr. Hope Scott. He speaks in it of "those who feel they can with a safe conscience remain with us while they are allowed to testify in behalf of Catholicism and to promote its interests; *i.e.* as if by such acts they were putting our Church, or at least a portion of it in which they are included, in the position of catechumens. They think they may stay while they are moving themselves and others, nay, say the whole Church, towards Rome." He adds, "Is not this an intelligible ground? I should like your opinion of it." When, however, this theory

was developed to its full extent, that "the whole cycle of Roman doctrine," as Roman, and as "confirmed by the Pope," might be held consistently with English churchmanship, he expressed his dissent from Mr. Ward's view. To believe that the spread of Catholic doctrine must bring the English Church nearer to Rome was one thing, and to work for this might be laudable; but to adopt definitely the whole of Roman doctrine —an essential part of which was the schismatical condition of Anglicans—and this on the ground that it was taught by Rome, and yet to remain an Anglican, was a further step in which he refused to acquiesce. "You are quite right," he says in a letter to Mr. Hope, "in saying that I do not take Ward and Oakeley's grounds that all Roman doctrine may be held in our Church, and that as Roman I have always and everywhere resisted it."

Newman did not, however, express his disapproval until after the appearance of the *Ideal*,[1] and during the two years preceding that event—1843 and 1844—Mr. Ward advocated his views in the belief that they had Newman's sanction. These were the years of Ward's greatest activity and influence. The present Dean of Westminster, in his published *Recollections* of his predecessor Dean Stanley, says in reference to this time that Mr. Ward "succeeded Dr. Newman as the acknowledged leader"[2] of the Movement Party; and Dean Stanley himself bears witness that he "exercised the most constant and energetic influence on all the ramifications of the party, and especially over the younger men," and that "by his unrivalled powers of argument, by his transparent candour, by his uncompromising pursuit of the opinions he had adopted, and by his loyal devotion to Dr. Newman himself," he was "the most important element of the Oxford School at this crisis."[3]

Several features in his teaching became more pronounced when he found himself, on the one hand, in some sense at the head of a party, and when, on the other, Newman's evident uncertainty and wish to avoid the responsibility of interference left Mr. Ward free to go his own way and in his own fashion. He never from the first professed to follow in every particular the teaching of the Tracts, and as time went on he more and more

[1] See Letter from Mr. Ward to R. G. Macmullen in Chapter XIV.
[2] *Recollections of A. P. Stanley*, p. 65. [3] *Edinburgh Review*, April 1881.

refused to adopt the tone or method of a party man in matters outside the essence of the Anglo-Catholic theology. His politics were to a great extent Liberal, while those of the party were Tory; he refused steadily to sacrifice his private friendships with holders of Liberal or Evangelical opinions to the demands of party feeling, and consequently was a welcome guest in circles in which the appearance of a Puseyite was otherwise a rare phenomenon; and conversely he broached theories—in High Church circles—little to the taste of the school which claimed to succeed to the opinions and traditions of Archbishop Laud. Professor Jowett tells me of the consternation he spread through the company, when he maintained at a dinner of Puseyites and zealous worshippers of the martyr-king, that the execution of Charles I. was the only defensible or possible course under the circumstances. He preserved throughout, in his advocacy of the Catholic opinions, the method which he had first learned at the hands of Arnold and Whately. Dialectics were his constant weapons of attack, and discussion the instrument alike of his intellectual progress and of his influence on others. He was slow to abandon the hope of influencing and convincing theological opponents. He brought the points at issue back to earlier first principles which all religious men held in common, and was ready to argue for Catholicism as the true expression and analysis of what was real and deep in the religion of all parties. His exposition commenced with the first principles of the moral law, and advanced, in completest logical form, to Catholicism itself. Even where he defended instinctive faith, his defence abounded in logic. "He is always arguing," it was said of him, "against the propriety of arguing at all."

The Dean of St. Paul's speaks of Ward's habits in this respect as follows:—

"He was not a person to hide his own views or to let others hide theirs either. He lived in an atmosphere of discussion with all around him, friends or opponents, fellows and tutors in common rooms, undergraduates after lecture and out walking. The most amusing, the most tolerant man in Oxford, he had round him perpetually some of the cleverest and highest scholars and thinkers who were to be the future Oxford; and where he was, there was debate, cross-questioning, pushing inferences, starting alarming problems, beating out ideas, trying the stuff and mettle of mental capacity . . . always rapid and impetuous, taking in the whole

dialectical chessboard at a glance, he gave no quarter; and a man found himself in a perilous corner before he perceived the drift of the game; but it was to clear his own thought, not—for he was much too good-natured—to embarrass another. If the old scholastic disputations had been still in use at Oxford, his triumphs would have been signal and memorable. His success, compared with other leaders of the Movement, in influencing life and judgment, was pre-eminently intellectual success. The stress he laid on the moral side of questions, his own generosity, his earnestness on behalf of fair play and good faith, elevated and purified intercourse. But he was not generally persuasive in proportion to his powers of argument. Abstract reasoning, in matters with which human action is concerned, may be too absolute to be convincing. It may not leave sufficient margin for the play and interference of actual experience. And Ward, in perfect confidence in his conclusions, rather liked to leave them in a startling form, which he innocently declared to be manifest and inevitable. And so stories of Ward's audacities and paradoxes flew all over Oxford, shocking and perplexing grave heads with fear of they knew not what. Dr. Jenkyns, the Master of Balliol, one of those curious mixtures of pompous absurdity with genuine shrewdness which used to pass across the University stage, stupid himself but an unfailing judge of a clever man, as a jockey might be of a horse, liking Ward and proud of him for his cleverness, was aghast at his monstrous language and driven half wild with it."

And while he employed freely in behalf of High Church views the dialectical method of the Liberal school, he likewise preserved Arnold's way of looking at religion rather on its practical side than its historical. It was in systems of self-examination and self-improvement that his directly religious lessons were given—with sanctions from Catholic doctrine, but aided by those methods of realising religious truth, of picturing before the mind's eye the details of Gospel history, which he had learned from Arnold. The interest of the historical Church, traditional views, party watchwords, ritual and ceremonial customs, never assumed in his mind, as they did in that of some others, any position save that of illustrating and ministering to the central truth, with which Arnold had first warmed his heart, "All for the glory of God." God's place in creation was the one great fact ever recurring in his lessons and moulding his views of all else. Its consequence—the absolute nothingness and dependence of mankind —was a thing he constantly realised, not as a subject for an

effective sermon, but as a tremendous and undeniable fact. The implicit denial or forgetfulness of this fact which is at the root of nearly all offences against religion, sometimes led to indignation, but sometimes seemed to him exquisitely funny. None that heard him tell it can forget the infinite amusement with which he used to give the account of a walk which he took with one of his Oxford contemporaries, of whom the story may perhaps be recognised as characteristic, in the course of which Ward endeavoured to place before him the infinite distance of creation from the all-powerful Creator. "When we realise this," he said, "we feel that our attitude in the presence of God should be abject." His friend demurred. "No, not abject, my dear Ward, not abject. Certainly it should be a deferential attitude, but not abject." The conception of carefully-weighed deference to the infinite majesty of a godhead which could in a moment annihilate us; the attempt to save proper pride and self-respect, to preserve moderation in statement, and nineteenth century conventional language, in a matter which dealt with the infinite and the indescribable, was to him *intensely* ludicrous, and his delight and sense of its absurdity unbounded.

On the general position which he now definitely assumed with respect to the English Church he was equally uncompromising. It had to be radically changed. Its Articles were as a whole Protestant. The spirit which possessed it was distinctly un-Catholic. Owing to its careless treatment of essential sacramental forms it was practically certain that its orders were invalid. To preserve external conformity to it was, as far as it went, to oppose Catholicism—though persons might be in soul united to the Catholic Church, and yet not relinquish this conformity. Still such a position was not *externally* Catholicism, it was High Churchism or Puseyism. A Catholic priest at Old Hall was put somewhat out of countenance when, in answer to his rather sneering remark, "I suppose you *call* yourself a Catholic, Mr. Ward," he received the reply, "Oh dear no! You are a Catholic, I am a Puseyite." He did not believe himself to be a priest, or to have the power of forgiving sins. He heard confessions according to the Puseyite practice, but would not give absolution, and at the end of his confession knelt down with his penitent and joined with him in a prayer

for forgiveness. Yet persons who became afterwards Catholics said he had more the quiet manner of a Catholic priest in the confessional than any of the other leaders. The theory that the English Church was, as an external institution, a living branch of Catholicism, he distinctly looked on, during these closing years of the Movement, as faltering and hairsplitting and unreal, just as the contention that the Articles were really Catholic would be. When Macmullen said to him one day, "Bear in mind that you are on our principles really a priest of God," Ward broke off the discourse, saying, "If that is the case, the whole thing is infernal humbug."

His rejection of so much of the old Tractarian creed and his hatred of sectarianism gave great offence to many who clung to the early traditions of the Movement. Party manœuvring, and the partial suppression of individual opinion necessary to corporate action, were out of his line. Any slip made by one of his own friends in controversy was frankly recognised, and a point scored by an opponent freely admitted. They called him the *enfant terrible* of the party. The new identification of Anglo-Catholicism with a primarily ethical movement; the dismissal of the old historical basis of Laud, Andrews, Hammond, as unimportant and in great part untrue; the transference of the whole controversy from a somewhat technical and antiquarian ground to the great battlefield in which were ranged the forces of infidelity on one side, and of Catholic asceticism on the other, were uncongenial and irritating to men who were unaccustomed and unprepared to deal with such startling issues. When they were unable to enter into abstract questions as to the capacity of the human mind for grasping religious knowledge, they retorted on Ward that he shirked history because he was ignorant of it. Ward—who thought the ethical and philosophical question quite important enough on its own ground—with characteristic exaggeration accepted the taunt as entirely true. He was *deplorably* ignorant, he said, of historical facts. He had been so all his life. Several of his contemporaries were the same. He remembered, he used to say, a debate at the Union on Mary Queen of Scots, in which he took part, and in which each side knew only one fact. But they made such good use of their fact that the debate was most animated and exciting. Perhaps

such treatment of the charges against him did not help to a better understanding. The older members of the party do not seem to have welcomed the growth of his influence. "For many years," writes one of them, "my idea of Ward has been as of a huge young cuckoo, growing bigger and bigger, elbowing the legitimate progeny over the side of the little nest."

The *British Critic* was, as I have said, the principal public *medium* through which Ward and Oakeley urged their views upon the Oxford party. Released from the calls upon his time which the office of Mathematical Lecturer had involved, Mr. Ward commenced a series of very long articles in that periodical, beginning in the October of 1841 with a review of Arnold's sermons, and following it up in April of the next year with an article on Whately's *Essays*. He contributed in all eight articles.[1] They were very uncouth in form, heavy in style, onesided in treatment—abounding in abstract argument to the exclusion of historical research or critical scholarship. These peculiarities their author himself was the first to recognise. But their bold and uncompromising advocacy of the new form of Tractarianism which has just been described, eventually brought about a storm, in the midst of which the Movement collapsed, and its original leader avowed his intention of leaving the Church of England.

There was no attempt in the essays at literary form. Mr. Ward had made up his mind that graces of style were "out of his line." He had something to say which he thought important, and he meant to say it. Let those who wished to understand his essays and be fair to his party give the required effort to master his arguments. These arguments he considered entirely satisfactory. In their exposition all he could promise was completeness; he could not, he considered, avoid dullness, and he did not pretend to charm or persuade. He told his readers in his first essay his own opinion that it was "wearisome," and referring later to the whole series of articles he remarked: "If any one thing is clear in the whole world it is clear that

[1] Mr. Ward's articles in the *British Critic* were as follows:—"Dr. Arnold's Sermons" (October 1841), "Whately's Essays" (April 1842), "Heurtley's Four Sermons" (April 1842), "Goode's Divine Rule" (July 1842), "St. Athanasius" (October 1842), "Church Authority" (January 1843), "The Synagogue and the Church" (July 1843), "Mill's Logic" (October 1843).

it was [to the task of convincing the reason rather than touching the feelings] that I directed my articles in the *British Critic*. The style of writing so argumentative, methodical, and unrhetorical; the language so harsh, dry, and repulsive, as I have continually heard it called; all this shows that I addressed my words to those who professed argument and analysis." The arguments themselves were fully and plainly stated, and the editor, Mr. Mozley, tells us that he himself felt "that their terminus was outside the Church of England." "I continued to read Ward's articles as fast as they came from the press," he adds, "not only from duty, but with a certain pleasurable excitement akin to that some children have in playing on the edge of a precipice."

Though the articles do not appear to have been artistic either in MS. or in print, they were accounted not only powerful but beautiful by many of his readers. Mr. Mozley bears witness to this in one instance, and to his own surprise that so it should be. "Strange to say," he writes, "and certainly much to my surprise, a considerable portion of the readers looked to Ward's article as the gem of the number." And he tells us that Robert Williams, referring to it, calls it "the most intrinsically valuable that has hitherto appeared," and "really surprisingly beautiful."

The editor himself gives us the reverse side of the picture. The MS. was sent in at the last moment; "the handwriting was minute and detestable; it defied correction." It consisted of "bundles of irregular scraps of paper which I had to despatch to the printer crying out for copy." "As for cutting the articles short, where was one to commence the operation when they were already without beginning or end." And when an alteration was suggested, "I did but touch a filament or two of one of his monstrous cobwebs, and off he ran instantly to Newman to complain of my gratuitous impertinence. Many years afterwards I was forcibly reminded of him by a pretty group of a plump little Cupid flying to his mother to show a wasp sting he had just received. Newman was then in this difficulty. He did not disagree with what Ward had written; but, on the other hand, he had given neither me nor Ward to understand that he was likely to step in between us. In fact, he wished to be entirely clear of the editorship.

This, however, was a thing that Ward either could not or would not understand."

It is possible that the rather abrupt and unconventional candour of portions of Ward's writings was one of the points which distressed his editor. Both in the *British Critic* and elsewhere this was noteworthy. If a point necessary to his argument was, as he considered, "out of his line," he would say so in print. If he made references which seemed to point to wide reading on his own part, he would add a note to explain the exact amount of the authors referred to with which he was acquainted at first hand, or the friend or book whence he borrowed his statements. Anything which had come in his way or affected his article—from a theory of Kant to a bad pen—might be commented on in print. If readers complained of the want of dignity of style which this involved, or of its destruction of rhetorical effect, he would earnestly explain that he had no idea of dignity of style, and that rhetorical effect was quite out of his power. "I do not mean," he explained in one of his essays, "that my style is unsuited for dry philosophical disquisition; but where poetry or rhetoric are called for, I am, alas, nowhere."

Passages illustrative of these habits abound in his early writings. In the *Ideal*, when the question of national character in relation to national religion comes into his argument, we find a comparatively brief treatment of the subject in inverted commas, with a footnote appended to the following effect: "The passage within inverted commas has been supplied me by a friend who understands the subject, which I do not." In referring to Kant, in an article in the *British Critic*, he explains to his readers that his acquaintance with that philosopher's writings is very partial, and that the only opinion he feels warranted in pronouncing on them as a whole is that they are very hard reading. Elsewhere he says that what he had read he read in French, as he didn't know German. He quotes St. Athanasius with the comment that he is only copying a passage he has seen quoted elsewhere. He gives an opinion of Niebuhr in one place, and of the early fathers in another, with the explanation that he is saying what competent judges say; and that the friend who supplied him with one view is prepared, if necessary, to come forward and

prove it. He refers to Luther, and gives a long note explaining the exact amount of that writer's works he has read, the edition he knows, and the date of each part of his reading. And in the essay on Mill's logic which he contributed to the *British Critic* in October 1843—an essay which attracted very wide attention, and to which Mill, according to Professor Bain's testimony, attached the highest importance,[1]—he appends a footnote to the first page which concludes as follows: "We should add that both here and in the body of the article we much fear that these references may be found incorrect, as the volumes to which we have access seem in some way incorrectly bound up."

Turning to the substance of the *British Critic* articles we find two different elements pervading them. There is on the one hand a vein of abstract speculation as to the true method of discerning religious truth. Obedience to conscience and the spirit of reverent inquiry are advocated as the great means of clearing the moral and intellectual eyesight in such matters; while these are to be supplemented by the guidance of holy men. All really holy spirits are witnesses to the fundamental truths of religion, and in proportion to their opportunities of knowledge they will likewise become more and more united in the details of their belief. Some extracts shall shortly be given, illustrative of this line of thought in the articles under consideration.

The other element to be considered in Mr. Ward's essays is the line he adopted with reference to the concrete circumstances of the Movement in those years. I have already spoken of his general view as to the work before the Oxford School. It was a view distinctly in advance of that advocated by Newman and Keble in the preface and notes to Froude's *Remains*. These writers had, as we have seen, clearly expressed their disapproval of the line pursued by the English Reformers, and had thus advanced a step beyond the party of Dr. Pusey, or of Mr. Hook and Mr. Palmer; but the protest against the Roman system which had been an essential part of early Tractarianism was to be found, though somewhat less prominently, in the *Remains*. Mr. Ward not only abandoned the protest, but, with slight and ever-decreasing parentheses

[1] Cf. Dr. Bain's *J. S. Mill: A Criticism, with Personal Recollections* (Longmans), p. 69.

disclaiming sympathy with a few practical corruptions abroad, openly avowed his acceptance of Roman doctrine, and his admiration of the ethos and religious practices of the papal Church. To undo the work of the Reformation, and to restore to the English Church her original Catholic character, with the ultimate, if distant, prospect of restoration to the papal obedience, was his declared aim, and the programme which he advocated for the Oxford school. The Catholic ethical and ascetical ideal, which the Protestant elements in the Reformation had gone far to destroy, were to be the main agents in this restoration, and distinctively Roman doctrine was not to be preached; but as, on the one hand, there was nothing in the essence or formularies of Anglicanism to prevent individuals from holding it, so, on the other hand, in proportion as Catholic spirituality was cultivated and preached, Roman doctrine would normally follow as its natural correlative.

If this programme differed from that of the earlier phases of the "Movement," much more did the method in which it was advocated differ from that of the early Tracts. And it was the peculiarity of this method which brought things to a crisis and ultimately broke up the party. If Mr. Ward's theory was unwelcome to Anglicans, his mode of advocating it could not but make it more so, as the unwelcome elements were those he most insisted on. The early Tracts had appealed to English ecclesiastical patriotism. Here was a Church with a noble history, immemorial traditions, a beautiful liturgy, a roll of saints in her calendar,—all this rich inheritance of English churchmen was being set aside by the accidental views and ignorant bigotry of the moment. They protested against an invasion of Protestantism as against the inroads of popery. They refused to take their theology from Geneva as they refused to take it from Rome.[1] They said that the English Church should be true to herself and her own past. Augustine had brought to England the faith of the early fathers. These were the spiritual ancestors of English Christians. Rome had deflected from the original tradition, though she had likewise preserved, as was natural, tokens of their common parentage. Both Churches had been in different ways untrue to themselves. The concern of Englishmen was with their own Church. Let

[1] See Tract 38.

them study the past records of her history and its existing witness in her liturgy, and restore to nineteenth century Anglicanism the spirit which the lives of Bede, Cuthbert, Anselm, on the one hand, and the Church of England Prayer-book on the other, breathe in every page. Whatever the precise view taken of the Reformation by the different writers of the Tracts, and the precise period at which the English Church was supposed first to have been untrue to herself, it is evident throughout that the appeal is of the kind here indicated —an appeal to *esprit de corps* among English Churchmen, to their pride in the Church's liturgy, in its institutions, in its history, in its monuments throughout the land. And in this spirit they are urged to protest against measures that would tamper with or destroy a heritage so sacred,—against the deformation of the Prayer-book by parliamentary committees, against the infringement of the spiritual parentage of its Episcopate by the suppression of Sees, against such an abolition of Catholicism as involved the obliteration of memorials of a great history.

Mr. Ward's tone was the very reverse of this. Whilst in theory he was bent on restoring the Anglican Church to what she had been before the Reformation, he preached practically a doctrine of humiliation before a foreign power. He dwelt throughout — partly perhaps from his love of looking at the furthest consequences of his principles, and viewing his theory as a whole, partly from an almost unconscious taste for what seemed startling and paradoxical,—on all those results and aspects of his view which were most irritating to English churchmen. He defended his tone on the ground that perfect frankness and straightforwardness were imperative, in a party which had been accused of preaching popery in secret and of being generally disingenuous. Moreover, he did no doubt think that all Anglican explanations of the Movement *did* veil or make little of what was in his view essential. The spirit of loyal submission to Papal authority, and of readiness to accept the doctrines taught by the Roman see,—these were not minor points, but integral parts of the Catholic position as he viewed it. To win converts by concealing this seemed to him unfair. He did not press for instant conversions to his own extreme views, but he thought

it only fair to let people know fully the doctrinal position to which he hoped ultimately to bring them. And so he continually called attention to all the "Roman" elements in his programme.

On the other hand, he abstained from insisting on what was persuasive—on those aspects which even his own theory presented, which might appeal to an Englishman's *amour propre*. It is not hard to imagine the consternation of "churchmen," as they looked through the pages of their *British Critic*. Ward's articles, while appearing in the professed organ of "Church principles," were throughout unalloyed endeavours to enforce the claims of Rome. Instead of exalting the English Church, and deploring only an accidental and temporary spirit which had recently got hold of her,—a spirit foreign to her true nature,—he dwelt simply on the "degraded condition" of "our prostrate Church," while he expended his enthusiasm on the existing Church of Rome. If he praised the English Prayer-book he explained that its merits were due to its being in the main a selection from the Roman breviary. Far from dwelling on the links which still bound the Anglican Church to a glorious past history, on her potential unity with the Church of Augustine, he declares himself "wholly unable to see in her any one of the external notes of being a Church at all during any part of the last three hundred years." The habits and institutions of Anglicanism were radically wrong, and must be reformed on foreign models. The free and easy ways of the Roman peasant in his Church are described with envious admiration; the *espionage* advocated in Italian colleges is exalted, to the depreciation of the freer system of our own public schools. English ways and ideas are viewed as narrow, and the English Church not as an institution of glorious character, recently obscured in part, but as a set of persons who are enmeshed in a corrupt system, which they ought to give up and change for a fundamentally different system. Scarcely a point was allowed for distinctively English feeling to cling to; Italian devotions and the most technical phraseology of the Roman schools concerning the Blessed Virgin and the Saints were brought into prominence. Matters were summed up in the *Ideal* by a sketch of the glorious vision in the future, on which Mr. Ward's imagination

loved to dwell, of the English Church "repenting in sorrow and bitterness of heart her great sin" of the sixteenth century, and "suing humbly at the feet of Rome for pardon and restoration.'

Preserving, then, all the logic of wishing for a restoration of the English Church to the Church of Catholic ages, but all the rhetoric of desiring that English pride should be humbled, and the Anglican Establishment brought to its knees before a foreign power, he adopted a position which had in it no possible elements of success among the Anglicans of that time as a body, though it gave him a logical defence for refraining from a change of communion. It is true that he disclaimed all idea of sudden and direct Romanising of the English Church in details, but the constant presentment of Anglicanism as radically heretical in doctrine and degraded in moral condition, and of Roman saints and Roman religion as exalted objects to be worshipped at a distance, and only not to be too literally imitated because English churchmen were wholly unfit to aim at heights so far above them, was practically the same thing. It was equally an attitude of humiliation before a foreign power. The High churchmen of that day, with their antecedents and temper, brought up upon Anglican tradition, and identified as a party with pride in the history of the National Church, could not endure such an attitude with equanimity, much less acquiesce in it. As long as the doctrine of Roman corruption on the one hand, and the Catholic elements in Anglicanism on the other, had been central objects held up by the Movement, there might seem to be a prospect of making a considerable party converts to a view which promised some ultimate hope of reunion with a reformed Roman Church. But when both of these elements were reduced to a *minimum*, though the logic of the position might be defended, and though a section of men might for a time remain in it—as a man may stand on one leg to show that it is possible—the natural forces of human character were against its general or permanent adoption. To the mass of Anglicans it was the rejection of their most cherished principles, while in those who defended and advocated it it involved a strained and complicated attitude towards both Churches—of Rome and England—which it was quite impossible to sustain. It was really a challenge to the English authorities: "On what

principle can you condemn us?" and was a practical boast of the impotence and absence of logic in the existing Anglican formularies, which could not exclude from the English Church what was so uncongenial to its whole spirit.

In illustrating the account just given of the Essays in the *British Critic*, I shall not attempt a full analysis of each Essay, but shall rather bring together passages typical of the lines of thought to be found in all.

The basis of all of them is the theory—to which Cardinal Newman referred in his University sermons—of the true method of progress in religious knowledge by conscientious action in the spirit of belief upon such religious principles as are placed before the individual. I have already referred to Ward's views on this subject in tracing the process of his conversion to Newmanism. His theory, however, increased in definiteness in 1842 and 1843, and some selections must here be given showing the form it assumed at this time. It will be seen that it approached closely to, but did not quite reach, that form of statement by which in the *Ideal* he justified his acceptance of the teaching of the Roman Church.

In the article on Whately's *Essays*, published in April 1842, Ward writes as follows:—

"Let us consider the case of a person born under a false system of religion, yet throwing himself heartily into it, carefully and scrupulously following his conscience, grasping and realising whatever is presented to him as moral truth. Is it not plain that since all religions have remaining in them from Divine tradition words and symbols which with more or less fitness really stand for deep and awful truths—is it not plain that such a person as we have described will go on more and more to apprehend and make part of himself these great realities, while that which is false and pernicious will, even without his knowledge, crumble away under his grasp from its own rottenness?—will he not have in his own conscientiousness a touchstone of continually increasing accuracy, wherewith unconsciously the good and evil of his creed will be separated off, and that creed will, to him at least, have been a real messenger of God? It is not, then, that he will in the natural course of things doubt its truth; on the contrary, he will believe it to be far holier and more sacred than it really is, and will be ever urging on his fellow religionists the importance and holiness of its maxims, if they would only act up to them. In the meantime, while he fully enjoys the approval of a good conscience, assuring him that his

faith is right before God, on the other hand he will have pent up within him, with ever-increasing number and strength, aspirations after some unknown good, whose realisation seems wholly beyond the power of the system within which he is imprisoned, and, more miserable still, will feel his utter inability of acting with any steadiness and consistency even up to the more ordinary rules whose Divine origin he loves to recognise. And now, supposing Christian missionaries to appear and put before him a more Divine and true revelation, will he not see here the solution of his difficulties, the satisfaction of longings, the fulfilment of desires which have so long oppressed him? Will not that character which the finger of God has been tracing within him cling and respond to that which is exhibited externally, and will he not by almost a spontaneous movement feel himself drawn into the vortex of this new attraction? It may be so; how far it is so will depend on three things: 1, the degree of real and intrinsic superiority in the system which they offer; 2, the clearness with which this is exhibited and brought to his apprehension; 3, the extent of the strictness and conscientiousness of his past life. As either of these are wanting, cases will arise in which only by degrees and after much deliberation a change is made, or in which persons even conscientious after a manner will recognise no call from God to abandon the position in which He has placed them."

In the Essay on Mr. Goode's book, *The Divine Rule of Faith*—written later on in the same year—he pursues the same line of thought. Mr. Goode and others had denied the possibility of a spirit of belief, had even said that the expression was unmeaning and self-contradictory. On this Mr. Ward writes thus:—

"Advice is often given to young men to pursue a certain line of conduct in order to the cultivation of a spirit of inquiry, why then is it unmeaning (even were it wrong) to recommend an opposite line in order to the cultivation of a spirit of belief? Or when we recommend a charitable construction of our neighbour's actions when we enforce the duty of believing him innocent till proved guilty, are we enforcing a contradiction in terms? Is it impossible to believe his innocence without full proof of it?"

In the first instance the inquirer will, he holds, from natural diffidence in his own powers of detailed criticism, rather look for some system, organised by those whom he can reverence, than pick and choose doctrines piecemeal for himself. He will look for "a standard above him, for a law which shall challenge his allegiance, a truth which shall embrace and

surround him and so not offer itself externally to his view;" but failing to find this, and compelled to make his inquiry to some extent individual, he will at least preserve the spirit rather of an intellectual learner, who withholds belief only when manifestly compelled to do so, than of the critic who looks in the first place for flaws in each system, and believes only what he cannot help believing.

"And yet in how different a spirit will his search be carried on from that eclectic method, which is to religion in general what Protestantism is to Christianity in particular. For let us compare in imagination the process adopted by the disciples of these two respective systems. The one makes the reason the sole arbiter to which all the remaining powers of the mind must be content to minister, the other makes conscience such. The one regards his fellow-men as witnesses to be called into court and questioned at his own bidding, the other thinks of them as his teachers, and (in some sense) his superiors; as commissioned by God, each after his measure, to build him up in the entire truth. The one seeks not, dreams not of higher object than the satisfactory classification of obvious and external phenomena; the other earnestly presses forward, if it may be given him to make some approaches to the view of that objective truth, whose existence the voice of conscience has witnessed to him with ever-increasing certainty;—that truth which shall be the adequate expression, and, as such, the harmonious interpretation, of the dimly perceived and apparently conflicting instincts which throng within him. The eclectic, in fine, making himself his one centre, test, and standard of religion, summons before him as if for judgment the various rival creeds; as though in moral, like mathematical, truth it were possible for mortal man to take possession of some vantage-ground, external to the object of his inquiries. True and startling type indeed of him "who as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God," for he claims to accomplish that which God and the host of heaven only can accomplish—to see moral truth from without, to grasp it as one system, to harmonise it into one intelligible whole, to view it, as some fine natural object might be viewed from a distance, in its just proportions, true colouring, and adequate expression. But the more humble inquirer looks out in all directions for the leading hand of God. His first care is to aim day by day at a deeper realisation, and by necessary consequence a fuller conviction of those truths which he has apprehended. Beyond the range of these, where his conscience grows into some new development, there he recognises a call from above to observe with reverent watchfulness whatever system of doctrines he sees to be coexistent with holiness of life, if from some quarter or other he may find that

which shall supply his need, and thus add to his existing stock of moral knowledge. But seeking the latter as he does, from no merely intellectual and speculative curiosity, but rather from the simple desire of practical edification for himself and others, it is no disappointment to find what we should think that common sense must have made clear to every one—that what is called an unprejudiced judgment on such subjects is necessarily an unreal one, and that an impartial and comprehensive view of all existing systems can only be obtained by him who is external to all, whose impartiality will therefore but result from inexperience of all moral facts whatever, and whose comprehensiveness of all will be synonymous with real knowledge of none."

Again, he held that the principle of free and critical inquiry, while professing to be in a special sense intellectual, did not really meet the requirements of the acknowledged laws of induction. The very apprehension—in any real or full sense—of moral truth must depend upon a previous temper of mind opposed to the principle in question. Thus phenomena which are in a special way connected with religious truth are in reality incapable of observation in such circumstances, and an induction is made, consequently, on a review of only a portion of the facts observable:—

"Surely this free inquiry is at last a very shallow principle, as shallow intellectually as it is odious ethically. The very appearance of moral truths, as all may know who have had a little moral experience, is as different to those who have acted upon them and those who have not, as we see in fairy tales in the case of some traveller who arrives at an object rough, hideous, and misshapen on the outside, but when by some talisman he obtains admission, he ranges at large amidst stately corridors and lofty apartments; he views with admiration, on all sides of him, harmonious proportions, costly adornments, rare and invaluable treasures. To express ourselves, then, syllogistically:—On things which are not in some fair measure apprehended (except upon testimony), no judgment can be passed; moral truths are in no measure whatever apprehended unless practised; cannot be practised unless unhesitatingly believed; unhesitating belief, then, on insufficient evidence is absolutely the only course left for one who may desire sufficient."

And if it seems that this theory makes religious belief too personal and destroys all common measure of minds, this is merely to allow that it partakes in a great measure of the nature of all those experiences which belong to our moral and spiritual nature:—

"All moral phenomena are strange and inexplicable; why is moral conviction to be the one exception? Who can give any account of those high and transporting emotions which the mere presence of a loved object excites? or of the absolutely wonderful effects produced on the mind by natural scenery, music, architecture, religious ceremonial, and the like? When the person who has the tastes in question is able to explain to one who has not, the mere nature of the feelings, not to speak of the connection between them and their exciting cause, then, and not till then, will be the fit time to wonder that grounds which appear trifling and nugatory to the gross and carnal-minded shall carry with them to the religious such deep and full conviction."

But he further considers that the objections to the subjective nature of his theory have their real origin, in part, in a deficient appreciation on the part of his critics of the subjective character of nearly all deep beliefs, so far as their ultimate basis is concerned. Their true grounds are latent, and in great part subjective. Either must there be latent and subjective grounds for religious belief, or there are no sufficient grounds. Mr. Goode, in disparaging such grounds, unconsciously advocates a philosophy of religious scepticism. The grounds alleged in theological controversy are truly not subjective, but they are not really, if the mind is candidly and accurately examined, supports on which the weight of belief is able to rest. And in pointing this out, Mr. Ward refers to a fact which has in our day a very practical bearing, that the unfinished and popular analysis of the justification of the public executioner's work, or of the soldier's profession, can be made readily to defend such awful crimes as the French Revolution witnessed. The truth being that the analysis was really but an imperfect and inaccurate explanation of the moral judgment which justifies the one class of acts and condemns the other with horror.

"In real truth Mr. Goode knows not what he is doing. So little is he accustomed, as it seems, to contemplate steadily his own ideas and carry them to their consistent conclusions, that he has not the faintest conception of the effects which would result from the principles he professes in the minds of those who do so. The great mass of men at all times greatly misconceive the real sources of their convictions; they have been taught that certain arguments prove certain conclusions, and have the whole logical process as if stereotyped *en masse* within their mind; the fact being, that were it not for really influential but latent causes, the grounds they profess

are altogether insufficient for the weight they rest upon them. And thus, when some great excitement or sudden crisis breaks the chain of habit, men carry forward their recognised premises and modes of reasoning into consequences little thought of by those who allowed them to acquiesce in such processes as legitimate. Who, for instance, has read the accounts of the first French Revolution and not been startled by the similarity of grounds on which the massacres of September or the executions by the guillotine were justified, and those which are the acknowledged defence of the laws of war or the punishment of death for high treason? How plausibly, or rather how truly, have the argumentative grounds of both been represented as identical? It is not—far from it, of course—that the real principles of these respective procedures are the same; but that the defence commonly stated, and accepted as sufficient, is not the real principle. And so it is that what are called orthodox Protestants, who, on the points on which they are orthodox, have many of them far higher and more influential reasons for belief . . . have learnt to imagine that certain definite texts of Scripture to which they appeal are the real support of their faith. As well might we hope to support Mount Atlas on the point of a needle."

That he himself had found the spirit of free inquiry sceptical in tendency we have already seen in his own references to his earlier history. As Kant balanced the sceptical tendency of his Critique of pure reason by the Critique of practical reason, so too Mr. Ward found that some antidote was needed to the perplexity in which speculation on the visible world involved him. That antidote—which he found in the deeper realisation of man's moral nature and its import—converted the perplexities of which I speak, which might otherwise have seriously threatened his entire belief in a Ruling Providence, into difficulties only, not perhaps admitting of solution, but still not sufficient to create serious doubt. But that the difficulties were to him very real and very vivid is evident from the following passage among others, although it is couched, naturally, in the form of an objection:—

"All things, then, as is indeed generally acknowledged, all things within us and around us afford certain evidence of the existence and attributes of God. But this leads us to another consideration of considerable importance; for let any one of our readers suppose himself brought into contact with some unbeliever, who should refuse to act upon this doctrine until it were proved to his satisfaction. 'I am told,' he might say, 'wherever I go, that the phenomena of the moral and of the natural world prove this; I act

like a reasonable being, I examine the evidence alleged, and do not find it conclusive. First of all there is the plain and most startling fact that evil exists (exists indeed to an incalculably greater extent, as far as we can see, than good); now, to speak of an all-powerful and all-merciful God co-existing with evil, is to my mind a contradiction in terms. Again, where can you even profess to see marks of infinite power, etc., that of which we have cognisance is of course finite; nay, in many particulars, I cannot avoid a suspicion that in all you say on the subject, your words far outrun your ideas; examine yourself carefully, have you really any distinct notion in your mind answering to the words "omnipresent," "having existed from everlasting," and the rest? Surely you are bewildered in a cloud of metaphysical subtleties, and persecute your neighbours for a logical chimera. How am I the less a good member of society, because I cannot give my assent to a mere assemblage of words which those even who use them cannot explain?' Certainly, on the principle of free inquiry, the victory will be in no way doubtful; it will be overpoweringly and triumphantly on the side of the sceptic; and yet is there any one truth on which more harmonious and deeply-felt proof is brought from every quarter to the religious mind than this of which we speak?"

In later years he used to state his views of the subject in a characteristically paradoxical form. "When I consider," he said, "the existence of evil, the creation of rational beings with foreknowledge of their eternal condemnation, the existence at all of eternal punishment, the apparent unfairness in many cases of moral probation, and the rest, it seems to me that it is almost a matter of demonstration that there is no God; but then it is a matter of absolute demonstration that there is a God."

Mr. Goode himself, the author of the book under review, is dismissed, at the end of the article, with a very uncompromising condemnation:—

"If we have extended our remarks beyond the usual limits, it has certainly been from no respect whatever for the work before us, for anything more utterly worthless, considered as a controversial effort, it has never been our lot to fall in with. In common fairness, indeed, to their powers of discrimination, we must take for granted that those persons in high station who seem to have praised and admired the work have done so without reading it; they are perhaps on other grounds hostile to the Oxford movement, but have found difficulty in dealing with the historical argument, and accordingly to have the countenance of one writer at least who

shows knowledge of the Fathers in that hostility is a relief to them. But any one who has looked at all carefully into this book will meet with no ordinary trial to his patience; he will find conclusions at which English or foreign theologians in past ages have arrived by means of accurate investigation, labour, and thought, contemptuously set aside by a writer who has displayed no one qualification for the task into which he has thrust himself beyond that dull barren memory of words which is ever found worse than useless to him, who has neither genius to inspire, sense to direct, nor self-distrust to restrain him."

Passing now from the general theory of religious inquiry to Mr. Ward's treatment of the burning questions of the time in their concrete form, we find that the writer faces very frankly the disturbing tendency of his language with respect to the Roman Church. He presses home, in season and out of season, all the consequences of the High Church conception of the Church Universal; and he refuses to abandon his insistence on the potential unity of an ideal English Church with Rome for the sake of greater actual unity among Churchmen in England. Doubtless such a sacrifice would have helped the cause he was trying to further. It would have veiled the unpopular consequences of the Catholicising movement, and would have made it more generally attractive. But it would have involved a reticence as to the full consequences of the theory advocated—a sacrifice of logical completeness and a tacit acquiescence in a distinctly illogical and imperfect theory which would to him have been intolerable. We see from his own letters how much he and Oakeley felt the disapproval of Dr. Pusey in this connection; nevertheless the utmost concession he offered to make to the remonstrances of the moderate school was, to abstain from ultra-Roman statements on condition that they in turn would abstain from criticising the Roman Church. He writes as follows:—

"It is sometimes urged, and in quarters justly claiming our deep honour and respect, that those who feel the real unity in essentials existing among 'High Churchmen' in England, do ill in troubling such unity by making various statements about other Churches, which cannot but give offence. But we answer that it is not only among English 'High Churchmen,' but foreign Catholics also, that we recognise such essential unity, and on what single principle of Scripture or tradition can the position be maintained, to meet the objectors on their own ground, that unity of a

National Church is a legitimate object of ultimate endeavour? Both Scripture and antiquity are clamorous and earnest indeed in favour of the unity of the Church; but is the English Establishment the Church? and of all points of agreement, for men to fix upon this as desirable, that no expression shall ever be used by members of the English Church towards the decided majority of Catholic Christendom (for such no English 'High Churchman' can deny the Roman Church to be) except expressions of enmity and alienation! Here is indeed a principle of 'Church union'! What would St. Augustine have thought of it? If there is to be an armistice let it be on both sides. If various highly respected persons will agree never to censure Rome, it is plain that they will at least be doing their part in removing one reason which exists for pointed and prominent descants in her praise. And now to take the question on another ground; if our present low state of morals and religion be closely connected with the State's tyranny over the Church, and if that tyranny (not to mention our doctrinal corruptions) is mainly encouraged by our isolation from the rest of Christendom, it is not a small responsibility which any one incurs, who uses harsh language at all against foreign Churches: if he is sure of his ground, it may of course be his duty to do so; but he must not forget that if it be not a plain duty, it is a very plain and very grievous sin."

The logical ground on which he reconciles his admiring references to Rome—their frequency and prominence—with the aims of the Movement, is most clearly expressed in the following passage, written in 1843:—

"And it may be worth while in the outset to remind our readers that we are defending a class of doctrines which on the whole have the distinct sanction both of our Church's formularies and of our 'standard divines,' and yet are wholly alien to the very fundamental principles of our present practical system. The very word 'sacerdos,' which Mr. Bernard and Archbishop Whately, whom he quotes, regard as the symbol and spring of anti-Christian corruption, is sanctioned in the Latin version of our Articles, which all the world knows to be of equal authority with the English. The habit of confession to a priest is clearly enforced and recommended in our Prayer-book; and as to ceremonial, all the ornaments used in the second year of Edward the Sixth's reign are absolutely enjoined by a rubric. So much for the Church's sacerdotal office; for her regal, we have fast days and festivals appointed by her authority. For her prophetical, the Athanasian Creed speaks of something, which it calls 'the Catholic faith,' as so authoritative, that its denial incurs an anathema; a sanction with which our Church has not invested the very fundamental basis of a 'Scriptural religion,' not even such doctrines as the canonicity and inspiration of Scripture

itself, essential and Catholic though these doctrines be. And in their general view of the Church's office our 'great divines,' it is well known, have displayed the same spirit. As to ceremonial religion, in particular, who can possibly go beyond Archbishop Laud in his attachment to it? and as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, let any one impartially peruse No. 81 of the *Tracts for the Times*. On the other hand, in our existing practice (though it is hardly worth while to set about illustrating what is so very plain) unlimited private judgment on the text of Scripture is openly claimed, and without rebuke, by our people. Again, we have in Ireland, *e.g.* abandoned the very word 'priest' to the Roman Catholics; an ordinary layman would be hardly more astonished at being told that his clergyman was in communion with the Pope, than that in the Eucharist the said clergyman offered a 'sacrifice' (Tract 81, p. 256), 'a propitiatory oblation' (Johnson, p. 314), 'a complete sacrifice' (Brett, p. 395) for the people; and certainly anything more utterly irreconcilable with the whole idea of the relative sacredness of holy things and places, or of a symbolised and sacramental religion, than the popular mode of behaving in churches or the ordinary form of Sunday service, it is difficult for the most active imagination to conceive.

"Now, this whole view, thus distinctly recognised by our Church in theory, thus wholly abandoned in practice, has been preserved abroad in practice as well as in theory. We are absolutely driven, then, were we ever so averse, to consider Rome in its degree our model; for we are met *in limine* by objections derived from the witnessed effect of these doctrines in Roman Catholic countries.

. . . . . .

"The English theoretical system agrees with Rome in these matters; the English practical system differs from her; in entering a protest, then, against our practical system in defence of our theoretical, we have necessarily the appearance of appealing to Rome against England."

Under cover of this general defence we find a good deal which must have been surprising to English Churchmen. For example, the reader is reminded incidentally (*On Athanasius*, p. 397) that the "exemption by special gift from venial sin is believed by most Catholics to be a privilege appertaining to the Blessed Virgin;" and he holds out as a threat to those who are infected by Whately's vague ideas as to the Divinity of Christ, that they will by logical consequence have to "abandon this pious belief and the religious devotion to the θεοτοκος connected with it." Again, the Pope is spoken of as the

"earthly representative of (the Church's) Divine Head." Transubstantiation is thus referred to: "The idea that to a Christian believing all the astonishing mysteries which are contained in the doctrine of the Incarnation the further belief in the real presence, even to the extent of the Tridentine definition, is a serious additional tax on his credulity, is not tenable for one moment."

Referring a little later to St. Athanasius's bold and thorough treatment of all the minute technique of theology involved in the Arian controversy—to the fearlessness with which he presses his argument, concerned though it is with what may appear almost fanciful and unreal in the subtlety of its distinctions, he foretells that "alarm and distress" will be a chief effect of such studies on many English Churchmen of the present day. "The truth is," he writes, "that we have been so long accustomed to a vague, shadowy, indefinite creed—to a creed which we dare not contemplate steadily lest it fade from our sight in the contemplation—which we dare not approach closely lest it melt away as it were from our very breath—that we cannot be brought into the presence of a real orthodox Catholic, 'knowing what he believes' and saying it, without feeling ourselves in a strangely uncomfortable position: we have been so long accustomed to theological gloom and twilight that the first intrusion of the light of day pains and distresses us. The pain and distress, then, must with such persons come first; but the sun brings with it real light and warmth notwithstanding; and they too will in time learn and appropriate their share in its happy influences; they too will in time exult that after the long night the day has begun to dawn on them; that they have been rescued from the oppressive, arrogant, and insulting dominion of Protestant superstition, and brought safely into the fulness and freshness of Gospel truth."

Elsewhere he speaks of the Roman Church as "Our mother in the faith . . . she to whom we should naturally turn for guidance," and laments that she "is regarded even by very many Catholic minds among us rather with distrust and aversion than with that feeling of regard and affection (we should rather say deep gratitude and veneration) which is her due." "This feeling," he adds, "whatever its grounds and whatever its merits, seems so deeply ingrained in the national mind that

it would be over sanguine to expect any very speedy revolution of sentiment."

In spite, however, of such open implications of the trust he reposes in the teaching of authorised Roman theology, he nowhere in these essays avows his acceptance of the whole defined doctrine of Rome—though it is certain that he did in practice accept it; and (what is more important) the conception which appears for the first time in the *Ideal* of looking upon Rome as an *infallible* guide without joining her communion—a view from which, as we have said, Newman dissociated himself—does not appear earlier, and, as we shall shortly see, does not seem to have been definitely adopted at an earlier date. Roman doctrine was held substantially as the legitimate outcome of primitive teaching, witnessed in the creed of the Church Universal, of which the English Church was originally a part. So far as more direct and precise guidance was looked for, it seems to have been sought from Mr. Newman. Commenting on Dr. Jelf's assertion in one of his sermons that standard divines (as Bull or Laud) who are dead are preferable guides to the living (as Newman or Pusey), he writes as follows:—

"It was a living guide which God intended for the Christian Church, and which we English have lost for our sins and the sins of our fathers; to follow, then, living authority is far more analogous to the Christian scheme as our Lord founded it. Two reasons may be hinted especially, though there are many others which we have not space to enlarge on, for the strong preference which, we are convinced, is due to the guidance of living individuals over that of printed documents. The one, that the very principal difficulties through which earnest and practical men are anxious to see their way will always be peculiar to their own time: and to resort for their solution to writers living in the period of Charles the First is like consulting St. Chrysostom on a subject of political economy. The other is that, partly for this very reason, partly for others, the credentials of living and breathing men are far more open to our inspection; we have far better means of attaining a deep and intimate conviction that we may safely to so great an extent trust the awful affair of our eternal salvation to their hands."

The articles in the *British Critic* culminated in the publication of a strong hostile criticism by Mr. Palmer, of Worcester, and in the abrupt termination of the existence of the Review

in deference to the strong disapproval its Roman tone aroused among the anti-Roman High Churchmen. The number for October 1843 was the last, and its place was taken by the *Christian Remembrancer*, which was conducted by the more moderate party.

Before going more fully into these events, however, a few words must be said as to Mr. Ward's relations at this time to the Anglican Ecclesiastical Authorities on the one hand, and to the English Roman Catholics on the other. Both he and Oakeley had agreed, as we have seen, not to teach distinctively Roman doctrine. By no stretch of interpretation could the English Church be said to teach it; and they, as teaching on behalf of that Church, might not exceed their instructions, although the looseness of the Anglican Formularies, and the early history of the Articles, were such as to enable them to hold Roman Catholic doctrine as a matter of private opinion. Their sermons consequently—both at Oxford and at Margaret Street, London—were mainly on the duties of the Christian life. However, in the matter of the Catholic ascetic ideal of the true character of the Christian life, they held themselves justified in insisting on those doctrines and practices—the observance of Saints' days, fast days, Ember days, and the like—which the Anglican Prayer-book distinctly recognises and teaches, though in practice they had become a dead letter.

There was enough in this to irritate the captious Protestantism of an average English Churchman, and ere long Bishop Blomfield was informed of what was going on. One of the sermons I refer to (though not the one of which that Bishop took cognisance, but one preached by Mr. Ward in Oxford in 1843) is before me now. The text is from Joel ii. 12, "Turn ye even to me, saith the Lord, with all your heart, and with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning." The chief part of the discourse bears the character of a moral exhortation on the nature of true repentance and the spirit of penance. But the "cloven-foot" of the Oxford school appears here and there. "I have followed the orders of the Prayer-book," he says, "in declaring after the Nicene Creed what holy days or fasting days are in the week following to be observed. But I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that as things are now in this

country, it is too likely that the greatest part of those now present will not rightly understand the very meaning of the declaration; and that hardly from any fault of their own, rather from the fault of us, the clergy, who have of late so much neglected the plain orders of our own Prayer-book." An explanation follows of Ember days and holy days; an exhortation to go to Littlemore or Iffley on St. Matthew's Day—as the Churches are open in both places on that day, concluding with the exclamation, "Who can tell the degree of blessing lost to us in this land by neglecting, as we alone of Christian Churches do neglect, these holy days?"

At Margaret Street, on the occasion I have referred to, Mr. Ward preached on the evangelical counsel of poverty, and Bishop Blomfield sent for him to give an account of himself. The story which is told of the interview is that the Bishop charged him with having preached in favour of "monkish" practices which the Anglican Church condemned. Charity and liberality were most commendable, he said, but to preach the excellence of giving up everything was popish and fanatical. Did not the Reformation condemn it in its abolition of monkery? "Where," he asked, "is your sanction as an English clergyman and not a popish priest for preaching such doctrines? Where do you find such practices recommended in our Church, or," he added in an unguarded moment, "in Scripture?" Mr. Ward replied, "One thing is wanting to thee: go sell whatsoever thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." He escaped, however, with a reprimand, and Margaret Street was allowed to proceed in its un-Protestant course for a year or two more. Its end came, —as a centre of High Church devotion,—soon after Ward's condemnation by the Oxford authorities in 1845, and Oakeley's avowal of participation in the censured views. But of this I shall have to speak later.

In April 1843 Oakeley published an article in the *British Critic* on "Auricular Confession." Father Whitty, afterwards Cardinal Wiseman's vicar-general, and still later on a Jesuit Father, who held for a year the office of Provincial of the Order in England, thinking that Newman was its author, wrote to him in connection with it, and Newman put him in communication with Oakeley. The result was an acquaintance,

which later became a friendship, between Father Whitty and several of the Oxford school, and an indirect consequence of this was a visit paid by Ward to Old Hall College—then the chief Diocesan Seminary for Catholic priests in England—early in 1844. Father Whitty, in giving his recollections of the visit, tells me that he found in Mr. Ward a knowledge of and acquiescence in Catholic theology even beyond what he was prepared for. He expressed his astonishment at Ward's remaining in the Anglican Church, while he was a Roman Catholic in everything but in name. Ward made two remarks in the course of conversation which should be recorded. First, as to his reluctance to move he said: "You Catholics know what it is to have a Pope. Well—Newman is my Pope. Without his sanction I cannot move." On the other hand, he admitted the anomalousness of the position, though he defended it logically. We have seen that it depended on the lawfulness of holding all Roman doctrine while still an Anglican. Still this theory might be at any moment condemned by the English authorities, and so become no longer tenable; and he allowed the desirableness of having a direct pronouncement from them one way or the other. "I am writing a pamphlet," he said to Father Whitty, "which is fast becoming a fat book, and which will, I hope, bring matters to an issue." This "fat book" was the famous *Ideal*, and we have now to speak of the circumstances which led to its publication.

The animus against the Oxford school which Tract 90 had aroused, and which the *British Critic* kept alive, was not directed exclusively against the extreme section. Dr. Pusey and his friends suffered for the sins of their brethren; and during the years immediately succeeding the celebrated Tract two blows were dealt by the University at the party in the persons of characteristically moderate men. The first was on the occasion of Isaac Williams' candidature for the Poetry Professorship in succession to Keble at the end of 1841. No one questioned Isaac Williams' fitness for the post, but the cry of no-popery had been raised against his party, and though the question never came to the poll, in the comparison of votes which was agreed to as a compromise to avoid an open *fracas*, the Puseyite candidate could produce only 623 to his rival's 921. Mr. Williams consequently withdrew from the contest.

The second manifestation of hostility to which I have referred was on occasion of a sermon by Dr. Pusey preached on the fourth Sunday after Easter 1843 on "The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent." Objection was taken to it, and complaint made to the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Wynter, by Dr. Faussett, Margaret Professor of Divinity. Upon this the Vice-Chancellor sent for the sermon, and appointed six doctors in conjunction with himself to examine it. These doctors were Dr. Faussett; Dr. Jenkyns of Balliol; Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel; Dr. Symons, Warden of Wadham; Dr. Jelf, Canon of Christ Church; Dr. Oglevie, Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology. Dr. Pusey was in consequence suspended from preaching for two years, but the Vice-Chancellor refused to give the grounds of the condemnation. The indignation excited among the High Church party was extreme; the more so as the feeling displayed was so manifestly unfair, the sermon containing no extreme statement of doctrine whatever. It was forthwith published and widely read.

It was perhaps not unnatural that the strong language of the immediate adherents to the views of Ward and Oakeley, and the *stigma* attaching to the whole party in consequence, should have aroused the indignation of the more moderate section against them. So far as Mr. Ward was concerned, the accentuation of the differences between the schools, and the irritation of the more moderate, were hailed by him with satisfaction. If principles were modified for the sake of peace, the Movement might be diverted from the all-important aim—the gradual undoing of the work of the Reformation.

"The extreme tumult and disorder," he wrote, "which at the present time pervades our Church, to myself, I confess, is simply a sign of good, and should be a matter of surprise only to those who have underrated the depth and the wide extent of corruption contained in that yoke which has so long oppressed us. As long as peace and tranquillity seemed to prevail, and compliments were being exchanged on both sides between the maintainers of the old conservative principle and the members of the new anti-Protestant school (as though there were no very substantial difference between them), so long, doubtless, there was much in the external aspect of our Church to awaken serious misgivings, whether the rising principle might not be stifled and the spreading flame quenched. But now—when opinion is pursuing its free course and shows plainly

that it will not be stinted—when both sides are beginning to discover the real points at issue and the Reformation itself is openly and undisguisedly attacked, the commotion which agitates the surface might be expected from the mighty influences which are stirring the depths. Principles and habits which have grown through three hundred years cannot be uprooted by one gentle and peaceful effort, and Protestantism is a demon which will cruelly rend the body from which it is preparing to depart."

Perhaps, too, amid the very strong and serious opinions he held as to the necessity for plain-speaking, there was an under-current of malicious satisfaction at the horror and bewilderment caused by his open avowals and his defence, from first principles, of conclusions which English Churchmen had learnt from their infancy to regard as impious, or Jesuitical, or sophistical, or associated with the ages of benighted superstition. That such things should be apologised for and pleaded for as not quite so bad as they were supposed to be, might be just endured; but how could Churchmen believe their eyes when they found a member of the enlightened and reformed Church of England writing of them as great and important truths, and lamenting over the intellectual stupidity and moral obliquity of Englishmen in failing to recognise them as such?

We can fancy amid the laborious and serious defence of his theory in the *British Critic* an occasional pause and chuckle of amusement as the sentiments of the moderate party came before him. One of them speaks with compassion of Ward and Oakeley, as being "open to the sophistries which were abundantly supplied to them in Romish books, and which Churchmen had no means of counteracting because they were read in secret and were not known to Churchmen." The same member of the High Church party continues his explanation in a similar strain, and marks the cunning of the Romish Church, and her adroitness in instilling the poison. "Rome," he says, "never loses a clue of this kind. Wiseman saw that there was an opening for the circulation of that false and plausible reasoning of Jesuitism in which he was an adept; skilful to put a plausible face upon the worst corruptions, and to instil doubt where there was no real doubt." Another clergyman wrote to Mr. Ward, full of horror at the superscription of a circular which Mr. Ward as Bursar had

sent to him. The circular was addressed to "Mr. A. B." in place of "the Reverend A. B." The clergyman expressed his concern and regret at Mr. Ward's conduct. He had known that his opinions were extreme, he said, but he was not prepared for his retaining his position at Oxford and at the same time openly denying the validity of Anglican orders. It chanced that the mistake was not Mr. Ward's at all. He had had many circulars to send out, and had given the envelopes to the "manciple" or steward of the College, to write the addresses. It may be readily supposed that he did not let the opportunity pass. He wrote expressing great regret for the mistake in the address. He trusted that it would not occur again. With regard to the supposed cause he could relieve Mr. A. B. from his painful suspicions. The envelope was addressed by the manciple. On receiving Mr. A. B.'s letter he had sent for that functionary and cross-examined him carefully, and he had much pleasure in informing Mr. A. B. that the result of the examination showed that he had no doubt whatever as to the validity of Mr. A. B.'s orders.

Mr. Palmer's alarm and horror at Ward's articles appears frequently in the pages of his recently published recollections. Such language as Mr. Ward's would have been impossible, he maintains, had his advice been followed, and a definite programme been imposed by the original leaders upon their followers. "By Newman's principle," he writes, "this audacious intellect [Ward] was set free to deal with religion in the *British Critic* according to the bent of its genius." He attempted to persuade Newman to interfere and check the offending writers. "I had an interview with Newman," he says, "and brought before him the language adopted in the *British Critic*, which had latterly become most painful to Churchmen, abounding in what was utterly unfavourable to the Church of England, and favourable to that of Rome. I pressed upon him the great offence such things had given, and urged him to use his influence as editor to suppress such teaching in future. Newman replied under evident excitement and in a spirit that was new to me. He said that he was no longer editor of the *British Critic*, that it had passed under different control; that the heads of the Church had thought fit to condemn him and to destroy his usefulness; that they

had silenced him, and that they would now have to deal with younger men, whom it was not in his power to restrain; that they would in future have to deal with a different class of men. He finally declared his resolution not to interfere."

Failing in his endeavours to induce Newman to move in the matter, Mr. Palmer set about writing a pamphlet called "A narrative of events connected with the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*, with reflections on existing tendencies to Romanism." He traced in it the dawn and growth of the Movement, and contrasted, with bitter lamentations over the excesses of the *British Critic*, the tone and objects of its first promoters with those of the "extreme" party.

It is amusing, at a time when a sympathetic estimate of all creeds is so general as it now is, to note the absence throughout the pamphlet of the sense that there were two sides to the question. But it gives a graphic picture of what the new school at Oxford appeared to be in the eyes of Anglicans of a certain type. I proceed to cite a few characteristic passages:—

"Difficult as it has been for churchmen to realise the strange and almost incomprehensible fact"—writes Mr. Palmer—"that any who had ever professed Church principles should have a tendency to Romanism, they have been gradually and reluctantly compelled to admit the lamentable truth. Actual secessions from the Church —few indeed, but yet sufficiently alarming; a change of tone in private society; and above all, the doctrine continually and systematically advanced in the *British Critic*, can leave no further doubt of the existence of the evil. That evil has been distinctly perceived for more than two years by some friends of Church principles, who have been withheld from taking any decided and open step in opposition, by apprehension lest such a proceeding might have the effect of precipitating events which they would deeply deplore. It seems, however, that there is more danger in continuing silent, when we perceive the increasing dissemination of most erroneous and decidedly Romanising views, under the assumed name of Church principles, and when the advocates of those principles are universally identified with doctrines and practices which they most strongly disapprove. . . . What can we say, what defence can be made when it is undeniable that Romanism in its very fullest extent has advocates among ourselves, that they have influence in the *British Critic*, that they are on terms of intimacy and confidence with leading men, that no public protest is entered against their proceedings by the advocates of Church principles?

It is a conviction of the necessity of making some attempt, however feeble, to arrest an intolerable evil, which has induced me to publish this narrative of our proceedings, and these records of our principles and views."

The following is Mr. Palmer's general summary of the offences of the Romanisers—which is followed by *pièces justificatives* of the indictment from the articles of Ward and Oakeley.

"Within the last two or three years a new school has made its appearance. The Church has unhappily had reason to feel the existence of a spirit of dissatisfaction with her principles, of enmity to her Reformers, of recklessness for her interests. We have seen in the same quarter a spirit of almost servility and adulation to Rome, an enthusiastic and exaggerated praise of its merits, an appeal to all deep feelings and sympathies in its favour, a tendency to look to Rome as the model and the standard of all that is beautiful and correct in art, all that is sublime in poetry, all that is elevated in devotion. So far has this system of adulation proceeded, that translations from Romish rituals and 'Devotions' have been published, in which the very form of printing, and every other external peculiarity, have evinced an earnest desire for uniformity with Rome. Romish catechisms have been introduced, and formed the models for similar compositions. In conversation remarks have been sometimes heard, indicating a disposition to acknowledge the supremacy of the See of Rome, to give way to all its claims, however extreme, to represent it as the conservative principle of religion and society in various ages; and in the same spirit, those who are in any way opposed to the highest pitch of Roman usurpations are sometimes looked on as little better than heretics. The Gallican and the Greek Churches are considered unsound in their opposition to the claims of Rome. The latter is held to be separated from Catholic unity. The 'See of St. Peter' is described as the centre of that unity; while our state of separation from it is regarded, not merely as an evil, but a sin—a cause of deep humiliation, a judgment for our sins. The blame of separation, of schism, is openly and unscrupulously laid on the English Church. Her reformers are denounced in the most vehement terms. Every unjust insinuation, every hostile construction of their conduct, is indulged in; no allowance is made for their difficulties, no attempt is made to estimate the amount of error which they had to oppose. Displeasure is felt and expressed if any attempts are made to expose the errors, corruptions, and idolatries approved in the Roman Communion. Invocation of saints is sanctioned in some quarters; purgatory is by no means unacceptable in others; images and crucifixes are purchased, and employed to aid in private devotion; celibacy of the clergy, auricular confession, are acknowledged to

be obligatory. Besides this, intimacies are formed with Romanists, and visits are paid to Romish monasteries, colleges, and houses of worship.

"Romish controversialists are applauded and complimented; their works are eagerly purchased and studied; and contrasts are drawn between them and the defenders of the truth, to the disadvantage of the latter. The theory of development advocated in the writings of De Maistre and Möhler (Roman Catholic controversialists) according to which the *latest* form of Christianity is the most perfect, and the superstitions of the sixteenth or eighteenth century are preferable to the purity of the early ages, is openly sanctioned, advocated, avowed. In fine menaces are held out to the Church, that if the spirit which is thus evinced is not encouraged, if the Church of England is not "unprotestantised," if the Reformation is not forsaken and condemned, it may become the duty of those who are already doubtful in their allegiance to the Anglo-Catholic communion, to declare themselves openly on the side of its enemies. I have no disposition to exaggerate the facts of the case; all who have had occasion to observe the progress of events will acknowledge the truth of what has been said." [1]

Mr. Palmer's "narrative" was received with a chorus of approval by all save the party against which it was directed. Many of the High Church party agreed that it was desirable, in pursuance of the same line of dissociating themselves from the Roman School, to start a rival *Review* in opposition to the *British Critic*. But the state of public feeling made rivalry unnecessary. Mr. Rivington, the publisher of the *British Critic*, on Mr. Palmer's communicating to him the idea in question, at once offered to suspend the publication of an organ so widely unpopular. Party feeling was accentuating all round, and there were "wars and rumours of wars." Mr. Ward having no longer the *British Critic* to write in, and viewing Mr. Palmer's "Narrative" and the action of his friends as a challenge which called for an answer, set about writing a full account of his views in reply to Mr. Palmer's accusations. Mr. Palmer tells us that he was uncertain how large a body the extreme party might prove to be, and suspected that it might be considerable. Mr. Ward himself seems to have thought it larger than it proved in the event,—when the crisis came and it was necessary either to leave the English Church or to renounce essential elements of Roman doctrine. His

[1] See Palmer's *Narrative*, pp. 149-151.

book was calculated to bring matters to an issue, and to show where each one stood, and was designed, as we have seen, as a challenge to the English Church Authorities to declare whether the position of the party within her pale was lawful or no. The book was written in a few months, and appeared in June 1844. It was entitled *The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with existing practice.* Of the sensation it produced we can judge from the words of contemporary writers, "All England was moved," says Mr. Mozley. It was the signal, in the words of Dean Stanley, for the "closing scene of the conflict of the first Oxford Movement." "Having elaborated a good logical defence," continues Mr. Mozley, "Ward took his ground, and defied Church and State, bishops and Universities, to shake his reasonings or drive him from his post. The defiance was so loud, so insulting, so explicit, the shame of not meeting it so great and so inevitable, that the other side had no choice but to quit themselves like men."[1]

The details of the book, however, and of the struggle which followed must be reserved for another chapter.

[1] In an article, which Mr. Mozley has since acknowledged. See the *Times*, 7th July 1882.

## CHAPTER XI

### THE IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH

1844

THE full title of Mr. Ward's book was "The Ideal of a Christian Church considered in comparison with existing Practice; Containing a Defence of certain Articles in the *British Critic* in reply to remarks on them in Mr. Palmer's *Narrative*." Its Dedication was as follows: "To all Members of the English Church who have her welfare deeply at heart, these pages, which have been prompted by an earnest desire to bear part, if it might be allowed, in the great work of restoring unity of doctrine and action within her pale, are respectfully and affectionately inscribed." And this dedication is further explained in the Preface, where the author writes: "The one object which has been nearest my heart throughout has been the attempting to lay down a sufficient basis on which all who profess what are called 'High Church' sentiments might be able to co-operate without compromise on any side." This basis is the principle — which he maintains that Catholic asceticism has ever presupposed — "that careful and individual moral discipline is the only possible basis on which Christian Faith and Practice can be reared." If it be allowed that the existing English Church entirely neglects, as Mr. Ward maintains, the duty of such moral discipline, and that in consequence the "standard of saintliness" and the "average of Christian attainment" among its members are "miserably low," then he concludes "that to remedy these defects is an object of so much magnitude as to offer the fullest scope for all our energies;—that to act heartily and unsuspiciously on

our points of agreement is the sure mode of arriving at agreement on matters which are now points of difference." At the same time he adds, "I have felt it a positive duty in no way to conceal my own deeply and deliberately entertained opinions on the ultimate result which would ensue from all wisely directed endeavours to reform and purify our Church," that result being a nearer and nearer approximation to the principles and doctrines current in the Church of Rome, and finally to repentance for the schism of the sixteenth century, and the wish to acknowledge once more the primacy of the See of Peter, and its divine commission as guardian of Catholic truth.

The *Ideal* was a closely-printed volume of over 600 pages, which had grown far beyond expectation in the course of writing. "The result of this mode of composition," says its author, "has necessarily been to introduce an admixture of temporary and accidental matter with the general statement of principles; an admixture which in many respects may increase the reader's difficulty in following the course of the argument."

In attempting to give an analysis of its scope it is necessary, as far as possible, to separate the elements here referred to, and this will involve taking the questions the work raises in their logical order, and not in every case following the unmethodical arrangement which the mode of its composition involved. I will endeavour first to give a sketch of the general conception and aims of the *Ideal Church*, noting afterwards the special application of them made by the author to the circumstances of the time, and his own defence of the outspoken and uncompromising tone he had adopted with reference to the Anglicanism of the day.

First of all we are reminded of the one ultimate aim presupposed in all real religion—personal sanctification and salvation. The achievements of the Church in her external history, her successes in education and civilisation, the contributions of mediæval churchmen to art and science, the temporal triumphs of the Church over the powers of this world, rising according to the image used by the Fathers, as the ark of Noe on the all-destroying flood, above the ruins of the old Roman Empire, above the inundations of the barbarous tribes, taming and con-

verting Frank and Hun, Goth and Vandal,—all such achievements, however they may enchain the imagination of her sons, are in themselves external to her true ideal. That ideal could have been realised as fully among a nation of slaves, or in the recesses of the Catacombs, devoid of this varied and attractive framework, as it ever has been amid the pageant of secular history. It consists simply and solely in the work of individual sanctification and salvation. "Let us carry with us," he writes, "this simple and obvious ideal of the Church's office (which, of course, like other ideals, is nowhere realised in perfection, but towards which indefinite progress may be made), that her one only object shall be to save the souls of those committed to her charge, and that the very proof which she offers to her children of her divine authority shall be the sense entertained by them of the spiritual benefits she imparts; that her voice shall be as the voice of God heard amidst the din of this restless and sinful world, guiding us in perplexities, soothing us in distresses, strengthening us in temptations, alarming the careless and worldly, cheering the contrite and humble of heart."

And what is the practical work looked for on the part of the Church with this aim? First of all, what are the conditions of sanctification and salvation? Two things—faith and obedience to God's will. And, as we have seen, Mr. Ward held these two to be in their fullest sense most intimately connected—spiritual vision depending on obedience, and obedience pre-supposing the recognition of God's voice in the conscience. This doctrine assumes in the *Ideal* the character of a distinct philosophy, some elements of which have been already referred to. He foretells the spread of what are now called Agnostic opinions, and he maintains that once they become recognised and popular, once they come before the average mind as plausible, arguable, in some degree probable, once it is found necessary in consequence to analyse to their basis religious first principles in order to withstand the know-nothing creed, the principles of the Reformation will be found to be in harmony with those of Agnosticism, and Catholic principles will prove to be its only antidote. And there are two separate lines of thought current among Protestants, in respect of which this view is developed. The Protestant prin-

ciple of private judgment or free inquiry is the first. He argues —and we have seen at an earlier stage his general line on this subject—that intellectual inquiry, pure and simple, gives no sufficient assurance of any religious truth—not even of the existence of God; that the difficulties arising from the existence of evil, from the restriction of our observation to finite results of creation, from the apparent incapacity of our intellect for dealing with super-sensible realities, and from other similar causes, leave the conclusion of the existence of an Infinitely Wise, Good, and Powerful Creator far in advance of the premises alleged. And as to the further steps whereby the Deist, the Socinian, the Latitudinarian, are refuted, the arguments are far too complicated to admit of complete settlement on merely intellectual grounds. An intellectual examination, then, of the grounds for religion, natural or revealed, leaves the case not proven; and the Protestant principle of private judgment gives no securer method of inquiry.

But then the question arises—if intellectual inquiry gives no sufficient warrant for even natural religion, are we to account it a matter of the feelings only? Are we to make little or no distinction between faith and emotion? If so, surely we give up the fight, and surrender to the unbelievers; we confess that belief is not rational at all. The answer to this is as integral a part of the *Ideal* as the attack on the principle of free inquiry. The difficulty as stated assumes that the choice lies between intellect and feeling—that candid intellectual inquiry or a merely subjective feeling or impression are the only grounds conceivable for religious faith. Mr. Ward maintains a third ground—the ground of conscience: and in doing so he attacks the emotionalness and subjectivity of Evangelical Protestantism as vigorously as he had opposed the pure intellectualism of the Latitudinarian. The line between conscience and emotion is as sharply drawn as between conscience and intellect. In this part of his inquiry he treats expressly the general question—is the human mind capable of knowledge *at all* of the great realities of Moral Truth—of realities outside the range of phenomena? Putting aside for the time questions as to differences of creed, or the history of religion in the concrete, he speaks of religious and moral truths as one, and as identified with transcendental existences beyond the world of

phenomena, and he asks the question, now so familiar, then scarcely considered in England—Is such truth within our reach at all? He maintains with the modern Agnostic that the *primâ facie* aspect of the question is that it is unattainable. It seems at first sight, and on an intellectual examination of the popular proofs and evidences of natural and revealed religion, to be so imperfectly established, and to rest on evidence so uncertain in kind, and yet to involve such momentous and far-reaching conclusions, as not readily to justify belief in the first instance. And again, its exhibitions seem at variance with each other. The moral codes of Buddhism, Mahometanism, Christianity, are in some respects directly opposed, and Christian revelation itself involves ideas at first sight contradictory, as where the Supreme Being is represented on the one hand as the embodiment of moral perfection, and yet in the details of belief current among Christians as arbitrary, capricious, tyrannical, revengeful, and the like,—or where the conditions of a probation imposed by Infinite Justice seem to be in fact unfair; or where children are said to suffer justly for their fathers' crimes. The whole class of knowledge known as religious will, then, be at first sight dismissed by the rational critic as the outgrowth of imagination and emotion, of fears and hopes, in the course of the varied history of nations, with no sufficient basis in reason, and abounding in impossible and not over moral conceptions.

But while in this first aspect moral truth fails from its identification with religious creeds—while the concrete exhibitions of religion lead the inquirer at first to an impotent agnosticism, religious truth must rise up again to the patient and earnest seeker from its indissoluble connection with moral truth. Religious creeds as the perversion or imperfect exhibition of moral truth are discarded, but the reality of moral truth asserts itself again in the conscience, and gives the lie to the wholesale rejection of religious truth in which the modern Agnostic acquiesces.

Existing religions, from this new point of view, must not be destroyed, but purified and completed. Immoral excrescences must be cut off; the inaccuracies of natural theology must be corrected; disproportionate attention to forms or externals remedied; but the heart of religion must in this

manner be saved, not destroyed. The first impulse, which tended to condemn religion because of its human errors, gives place to the wish to save it for the sake of the divine truth which lies hid beneath them.

This deeper philosophy begins by the recognition as a most certain fact of something infinitely above our nature which imposes upon our conscience its duties, an objective reality of which we are forced to own how little we *can* possibly know, and yet of which we can hope for some economic representation adapted to our needs here. This recognition does not begin by directly answering or even contradicting the negative criticism of the Agnostic; rather it draws attention to a phenomenon hastily and imperfectly noted by the negative critic. That critic had presented as exhaustive two alternatives as to the origin of belief, and two alternatives as to the phenomena under review. Belief must have its origin either in intellect or in emotion; intellect could not support either Christian or Theistic belief, therefore they were emotional and irrational. The elements to be considered in reviewing the human mind and its sources of knowledge were intellectual and emotional; nothing commensurate with religious ideas could be found in the intellect, therefore their seat was in the emotions or fancy. Mr. Ward, on the other hand, noted with insistence a third process of mind and a third class of phenomena. The sense of duty, what Kant calls the only good thing in itself, the "good will" which obeys that sense, the categorical imperative "thou shalt" in the human conscience; these are as distinct, he maintains, from emotion as they are from the merely intellectual faculties. Conscience may not tell much at first, but it is a faculty affording a glimpse of something *objective*, infinitely higher in kind than the sensible things around us, and an earnest man will set about seeing if he can cultivate the faculty and develop this glimpse into something fuller and clearer. And here we have the third attitude, to which the *Ideal* calls attention. Discursive argument on known facts which one understands and fully grasps, is one thing; blind surrender to subjective feelings another; but there is a third which consists in watchful and reverent attention to an external power above us, recognised as real and authoritative, and yet not fully understood. "As the eyes of the handmaid

are on the hands of her mistress, so are our eyes lifted to the Lord our God, until He have mercy." The merely judicial attitude of reviewing the things around us gives place to the expectant, reverential, humble attitude of a learner, when the conviction arises that something may be revealed to us higher in kind, we know not what, not exactly commensurate with our faculties, and yet not entirely beyond them, enlightening as light is to the eye-spots of the lower forms of animal existence, rather than as the sun to human eyes, yet enough to help in the guidance of our own footsteps.

This attitude is called in the *Ideal* the attitude of Faith, and—to express its practical bearing—involves the regarding of any religious system with which one is brought in contact in the spirit of a learner, anticipating that it will have much to teach, and that what is true in it will take possession of the purified soul, while what is false will fall away from its own inherent rottenness, in proportion as the spiritual vision becomes clearer. But how is this purifying of the spiritual vision, this increase of the seeing power of conscience, to be gained? By obedience to God's will. And here is the marked contrast between the theory of the *Ideal* and the subjective theory of the Evangelicals. Luther's doctrine of justification, and the many shadows and more or less perfect reflections of it to be found in Low Church Protestantism, are based upon private assurance and feeling, and have, Mr. Ward maintains, no direct reference to the will's effort to conform itself to an external standard; and this defect extends to their whole view of religious belief. The individual *feels* justified and assured of salvation by faith in the Redeemer. There is no voluntary act of submission to a power outside him. The utter worthlessness of all works before justification is insisted on, and works after justification are the results of the spirit working within the soul. Moral effort in rendering the soul fit for grace, in submitting to God's will, in conforming with grace when it is given, is not admitted into the system. Election and damnation are totally arbitrary. The subjective assurance results from no objective law, offers no test whereby fancy can be distinguished from spiritual perception, but begins and ends in itself.

This doctrine denied, according to Mr. Ward, the very

first principle of morality; the principle, namely, that the struggle to do right and obedience to conscience are the springs of true moral and religious life. It opened the door to a religion of feelings rather than of duties, and to the fanatical excesses of religious excitement. It was thus in direct contradiction to natural religion, which has its very foundation in the "sense of law." A man was acceptable, not because he conformed to the law, but because a capricious power chose him. He knew that he was acceptable not by comparing his will with the law, but because his feelings were specially moved. In proportion as such a doctrine gained footing, the Agnostic party were only too well warranted in identifying religion with excited emotion, and denying its claims as the guardian of a moral law which was thus directly contradicted. The intellectual basis of Protestantism, then, was utterly insufficient; and its ethical superstructure gave it no higher title to esteem, exalting, as it did, feeling at the expense of duty, and allowing on occasion the arbitrary will of the Deity to supersede or oppose morality itself. Mr. Ward constantly guarded himself against being supposed to make such accusations against individual Protestants, whose personal piety was so far superior to their principles; but, viewing the principles as such, of free inquiry and of justification by faith, and viewing their inevitable tendency as they become more fully realised, he condemned them as utterly subversive of true religion.

In asserting, then, the principle of obedience to conscience as the guide to more light, he insisted on the very points which Lutheranism denied or passed over; on the intrinsic worth of moral effort, on the necessity that revealed religion should have its basis in natural religion, should develop and not contradict it, on the moral light which comes not from attending to subjective feelings, but from conformity to objective duty. If duty, perceived by conscience, is something really existing and outside the individual, and inseparably bound up with the transcendental existences of which revelation speaks to us, it is in accordance with analogy to look for more accurate and full perception on these matters from the constant obedience of our nature to its voice. Further, those men whose obedience has been more complete than our own, will have, on the same

principles, fuller insight into religious truth than ourselves, and will be our natural teachers.

Such were the principles with which he himself had approached the study of the Catholic Church, and he found there, as we have seen, their natural fulfilment and development. Its standard of sanctity seemed to him the highest, the most complete development of natural goodness. Its roll of saints was the noblest. It claimed for itself Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, Apostolicity, and thus corresponded with that truth which must be one, must be holy, must be the same for all, and which claims to be given by supernatural interposition; and by these titles, he maintained, we are led in proportion to our obedience to moral light, to look on it as the repository of religious and moral truth, or rather as that power which is commissioned to teach us all we can know or understand of that truth. Its dogma is accepted as the imperfect revelation of truths far beyond our full comprehension, proved by its effects, because it aids in spiritual advance, and has nourished and brought forth saints, and saints are ultimately alike the witnesses and teachers of religion and morals.

This theory lays stress, as is obvious, on the personal character of each man's apprehension of religious doctrine, and hence the work of the Ideal Church—of which we spoke at starting—in individual training. If religious belief depends in the last resort upon moral discipline, and if that discipline is in turn dependent on the realisation of religious dogma as a motive for action, we at once see the general view maintained by Mr. Ward as to the double office of the Church, as teaching orthodoxy to her children, and as supplying means for the highest ethical training. The whole work hinges upon these fundamental conceptions. Religious belief is nowhere allowed to be normally the result of the impartial review of certain considerations, but is uniformly maintained to depend finally upon an insight given by a special course of action, and it is for the Ideal Church to prescribe that course of action—in her ascetic and spiritual discipline—and so to enable her children to see the truth of their belief. And this same system of religious training, by meditation and self-examination, as it guards from speculative doubt by making the soul realise those moral first

principles on which belief depends, so too it guards against practical neglect of duty by bringing before the mind the reality of God's judgments and of the future life.

And now, having spoken of the central principle of the work, I have to give some extracts illustrative of points I have named, and of the various modes in which he conceives that the Ideal Church may carry out its work in the world.

First, as to the fundamental principle that conscience is the organ of religious inquiry, and our primary informant in matters of moral truth, he defines his position as follows:—

"Conscience, viewed in the abstract, has no power of discovering more than the immutable principles of morality. But in proportion as it is pure and well-disciplined, it discriminates and appropriates moral and religious truths of whatever kind, and disposes the mind to listen to this external message rather than to that; while each new truth thus brought before it from without, in proportion as it is deeply received and made the subject of religious action and contemplation, elicits a deep and hitherto unknown harmony from within, which is the full warrant and sufficient evidence of that truth.

". . . A course of moral action leads us to know the existence of *realities* and of *essences*, as opposed to mere shadows and phenomena; it leads us to know that, wholly without those limits of space and time which bind the intellect, there exists an objective somewhat—call it, if you please, Moral Truth; that the real form and lineaments of this somewhat are absolutely beyond the reach of our faculties; that we cannot possibly know more of it here on earth than that (in all probability) infinitely small part which happens to come in contact immediately or mediately with our own conscience; lastly, that our knowledge, however, of that part may increase with rapidly advancing progress, in proportion as we bring the intellect and the lower part of our nature into servile subjection to our will, and that again into servile subjection to this external law. Knowledge of phenomena is obtained by the intellect, knowledge of realities by the conscience; knowledge of phenomena by inquiry, knowledge of realities by obedience; knowledge of phenomena is obtained by us as masters and as judges; knowledge of realities is obtained by us as disciples and slaves; the one pursuit tends to pride, the other indispensably requires and infallibly increases humility.

"He who is thus disciplined, who feels deeply his exceeding blindness, helplessness, and ignorance, and the existence without him of an unknown and unspeakably precious reality, will eagerly believe and appropriate whatever is placed before him in the course

of nature professing to be a voice from, or an economical representation of, that reality." [1]

Whether such a professed voice from above be what it claims to be must be learnt by experience. If it is found to correspond with and develop the moral nature, and in proportion as it does so, that is the best sign that it comes wholly or in part from the world of Moral Truth, and thus we may have a portion of true revelation mingled with portions of error. It may be that an inquirer must rest content with such fragmentary knowledge.

"But," he adds, "rather would he anticipate that there is some home in which this moral reality may have a secure rest and lodgment, that it may be dispensed to men according to their needs; or at least he would be drawn with a most eager and spontaneous longing towards any body which should profess to be that home. And those marks in any society would especially attract his view which appear to be most kindred in their natures and origin to Eternal Truth itself; for instance, to use ecclesiastical language, *Unity* in doctrine throughout all ages; *Sanctity; Catholicity*, its proclaiming one and the same message in all lands; *Apostolicity*, its referring back to some signal interference with the visible course of things from the world 'beyond the veil.'" [2]

The Catholic Church professes to be such a home, and offers at once the notes of Unity and Catholicity, while it claims likewise to inherit the truth of the Apostles. However, the chief note of all, and that most within the power of the faithful and devout Christian to test, is that of Sanctity. The fulfilment within the Church in an infinitely higher degree of that goodness in the natural order which conscience apprehends in the first place, is the decisive note of her divine commission. The saints of the Church are the great witnesses to her divinity. In them are reproduced in some measure the life of Him who was the perfect fulfilment of the Moral Law; and as He was Himself the witness to the truth of His message,

[1] Pp. 509, 510, 512.

[2] A friend of Mr. Ward's—a careful thinker and student—notes in connection with the points referred to in the text the curious resemblance in view on these matters between Ward on the one hand and Kant and Fénélon on the other, and yet the difference in method. The mystical insistence on conscience as the source of religious knowledge is Kantian; the love of souls is suggestive of Fénélon. But what is peculiar to Ward is his "always speaking according to the fulness of his own mind, and not according to the mind—full, empty, or obstructed—of his friend or opponent."

so are the saints in all ages witnesses of the home in which that message is fully preserved.

"In studying," he writes, "the endlessly various specimens of the saintly character we more and more clearly discern in each one of those individuals, indefinitely varying from each other in natural disposition, in period, rank, education, sex, and age, a certain inward character, surprisingly similar to that of all the rest, and evidencing a certain complete and singular fulfilment of the Natural Law. Thus we learn the peculiar expansiveness and elasticity of the Gospel gift, and the wonderful capabilities of human nature, so infinitely beyond all that could have been imagined before Christ came; and by means of these we bring home to our imagination the perfect and entire law of God, with a minuteness, particularity, and diversity of exhibition, which could in no other way have been attained. Above all the lives of saints are, as it were, spiritual ladders by which we rise into a continually fuller and less inadequate appreciation of His life, who is the one full embodiment of that law. . . .

"[The saints] are in every age the great external witnesses of Christianity, the great visible notes of the Church. They bear witness in their own person, a far surer witness than could be borne by any other external sign or proof, to the depth, reality, efficaciousness of Christian doctrine; their living example is the warrant whereby we receive the recorded actions of holy men in times past as possibilities and truths, their habits and ways of thought, their very personal presence, are, as it were, the quickening and informing spirit, whereby the great events of the Church start from the canvass and present themselves to our imagination as realities with a definitive existence and meaning; while at the same time the same holy men, not by means of formal calculation, but by the spontaneous impulses of the Holy Ghost within them, are the great originators of that infinite variety of external shapes which the one ancient truth assumes in every successive period, that it may cope with the peculiar evils and meet the peculiar exigencies of that period." [1]

As to the offices of the "Ideal Church," he maintains that she should ever be active and on the alert, with the one object of sanctifying and saving all she can. She is to do corporately, and by her ordinances, and with uniform rules and a uniform spirit, what many good Christian teachers would wish to do each in his own way. She is thus to have all the advantages of order, numerical strength, development from antecedents, experience by past failures and successes, acknowledged rules

[1] Pp. 556, 557, 558.

and standards. He treats of her work and its spirit, speaking of her in some sense as of a *person* with a distinct character.

Some samples of his writings on this head will be in place here.

"A Church which is ever on the watch to catch souls," he writes, "will take especial advantage of those moments, when from reverse in worldly business, or sickness, or sorrow, or from some temporary religious impressions, an impulse towards good is felt by one who has hitherto led a worldly or an openly immoral life. She will 'fall on the neck,' as it were, of such an one, 'and kiss him'; she will endeavour to place religion before him in a light as attractive as truth will permit, and to make that task as easy and joyous to him as the case allows, which at best must be most wearisome and grievous, of retracing his steps and disentangling himself, under God's grace, from the miserable thraldom of sinful habits. At the same time some wisely and religiously constituted system of observance must be always at hand, to fan the embers of piety into a steady glow; to obtain possession of him, as it were, and secure him from the world, before the latter has had time to reassert its dominion; to bring before him religious truths and sanctions, and impress them on his whole nature; to strengthen and protect him in holy seclusion, till he may be able again to go forth into the world without imminent danger of falling a second time away from the narrow path.

"But the father who fell on the younger son's neck and kissed him said also to the elder, 'Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine.' An object, then, still dearer to her heart even than comforting and retaining the penitent will be to guide those aright who have never wholly withdrawn themselves from under her Lord's light yoke; to relieve their perplexities, point out their duties, direct their obedience, show them their spiritual dangers, guide their penitential acts, and mould their habits after the Christian model. All this without cramping or fettering, while she directs the free and natural development of their character, or interfering with that endless diversity of opinion which must ever exist on the application of true principles in each particular case. This diversity was plainly intended by God, and is an important means by which He works out His purposes in our regard; nor could the Church more seriously mistake her duty than by an attempt to substitute, on such matters, arbitrary ecclesiastical dictation for well regulated individual responsibility.

"A function of the Church, even more important than any we have yet named, is what may be briefly described as the training up of saints; the sedulously tending of those who, whether in reward for a consistently holy walk in time past, or by the free

working of God's grace, have aspirations within them that tend to a high and noble strictness of life, and who thirst for a far more entire self-abnegation and devotion to God's will than that for which the ordinary walks of life afford sufficient scope. To place before Christians such as these the opportunity of consecrating wholly to heavenly realities those ardent and enthusiastical feelings, which men among us ordinarily squander on earthly and transitory objects, objects which neither are worthy of them, nor can possibly satisfy or repay them; this is an office which an ideal Church will prize and cherish in her heart of hearts, as her noblest and most transporting privilege; she will feel it as the greatest of all the mercies that she has received from God, that she is allowed, in return as it were for His infinite loving-kindness, to offer before Him specimens of the capabilities of our common nature, and visible proofs of the inexhaustible power of His wonder-working grace. But in times like the present (as indeed at all times more or less), for the mere purposes of practical efficiency, such institutions will have an absolutely inappreciable value. We are, if I may use a homely expression, at a perfect standstill for want of saints and saintly men; surrounded and menaced on all sides by dangers the most imminent, from which, humanly speaking, we see no means of escape, until it shall please God to raise up for our needs, and to do His work among us, intrepid, self-devoted, ardent, enthusiastic, humble, holy, heavenly-minded men. A truth to which I shall have occasion more than once to recur in what will follow.

"From what has been said it results, that a Church such as we are now contemplating will possess a profound and accurate system of *moral*, of *ascetic*, and of *mystical* theology. On every other subject except theology it is an universally admitted axiom, and even in theology few would deny it in terms, that empirical knowledge is worth very little, but that scientific knowledge may be worth a very great deal. It seems very plain that a person, whose peculiar study it is to gather facts from all quarters, to examine them carefully, to classify and arrange them, is likely to take a very much more enlarged view of any given *phenomena* than one whose experience is partial and (as it were) accidental: that one whose special business it is to speculate, whose education has been directed to that very object, and whose life is one continued practice in its performance, will certainly speculate to very much better purpose than one whose habits have been in quite a different direction: lastly, that principles formed after deep and patient study, under no present bias, and with a single eye to truth, may possibly be very good; but that principles extemporised on the spur of the moment to meet a present emergency, and under the bias caused by the peculiar circumstances of that emergency, will to an absolute certainty be altogether bad. But how much stronger does the

contrast become, when we remember that the *phenomena* now in question are not those accumulated by one man, however candid, observant, and indefatigable, but the recorded experience of all past ages of the Church; and that the speculation is not that of one thinker, however gifted, but of a series of doctors, each one reviewing, and modifying or confirming, the *dicta* of those who have preceded him; and whose theories are confronted and verified every year by an almost innumerable number of practical applications. This then being granted, it follows that, whereas the Church witnesses in the midst of us the great principles of morality, and is bound moreover to assist her children in applying them to their peculiar circumstances, in knowing what is and what is not sin, and how grievous in themselves are particular sins, she must needs have a recognised body of *moral* theology: that whereas she is bound to guide them to the various moral and theological virtues, to all holy and Christian tempers of mind, and to implant maxims of conduct and inculcate practices of piety, which shall lead to those virtues and tempers, her ministers must be sufficiently versed in a certain uniform and recognised body of *ascetic* theology: that whereas her highest office is to train, not ordinary Christians, but those predestined to be saints, and whereas those of her children, who are climbing up that arduous and dizzy path, are free in great measure from the temptations which beset ordinary men, but are exposed to perils of a more subtle indeed and transcendental, but no whit of a less fatal, character; whereas they require to be warned against the very masterpieces of Satan's subtlety, who would fain 'transform' himself even 'into an angel of light,' if by so doing he may rob one among those exalted spirits of the crown prepared for him; and whereas *their* salvation (speaking generally) is no more assured before the end of their pilgrimage than that of the humblest Christian; she must possess a certain number of thorough proficients in the noble and wonderful science of *mystical* theology."[1]

Further, he maintains that there is really a close connection between the highest attainable holiness in conduct, and the knowledge of pure doctrine in its entirety.

"The duty of a Christian (as distinguished from his gifts and privileges) may profitably be contemplated according to the well-known division of faith and obedience. In the former is included (though much more is also included) *knowledge* of the great Christian doctrines. Christian precept and Christian doctrine, these are the two great external facts which essentially claim the Christian's attention and allegiance. And in a very remarkable manner they react on and correspond to one another. Pure doctrine requires

[1] P. 15-18.

for its reception a purified heart, a purified heart requires for its support and progress in holiness pure doctrine. In no other way than by the habit of strict and anxious conscientiousness can that faculty be acquired, which alone hears God's voice where others hear it not, or interprets His words aright where all hear them. In no other way than by contemplation, reception and hearty appropriation of sound doctrine, is this conscientiousness made really Christian obedience, preserved in its first fervour, or rather in a continually increasing degree strengthened, deepened, extended, led forth into a wider range, and endued with a higher and more generous quality; adding refinement and delicacy to zeal and warmth, confident hope to godly fear, joyous exultation to deep contrition and humility. Other studies, however profitable, even the religious study of Holy Scripture, much more its *critical* examination, or the knowledge of Christian antiquities, or of Church history; still more again the evidences of religion, or the geography of the Holy Land, or the harmony of sacred and profane history,—no part of which class indeed has any pretension to be considered any part or parcel of theology at all;—but *all* these, except so far as they are contained in one of the two first-named classes, are no *essential* part of the Christian's knowledge. "Many barbarous nations," says St. Irenaeus, "believe in Christ without written memorial, diligently preserving the old traditions." Without reading Scripture or knowing a word of it, many *may* be good Christians; without obeying Christ's commandments and believing in His doctrine, they *cannot*. And the Church from the first has acted upon this principle. She has excommunicated those, and those only, who were sinful in life, or heretical in doctrine.

"The drift of this theorising is to explain the intimate and indissoluble connection which exists between the combats sustained by a pure Church against sin (which we have already viewed in some of their multiform aspects) and the witness borne by her to Christian doctrine. There is perhaps no one principle in all history, on which there is so surprising a consensus of *a priori* reasonings with observed *phenomena* as on this: that any Church which shall not contain at her centre a deep dogmatic theology, exuberant with life, indomitable in energy, that Church is languid in her spiritual functions, wavering and unauthoritative in ruling her own subjects, feeble and prostrate in her external relations. And what the wonder? Saints are the very hidden life of a Church, and saints cannot be nurtured on less than the full Catholic doctrine."[1]

The Ideal of a Church is further developed "as gratifying our aspirations and affections." The tables are turned on those who uphold the Reformation as a protest against formalism

[1] Pp. 18-20.

and a vindication of individuality in the spiritual life. Such offices are claimed as especially Catholic traits in the *Ideal Church*. He recalls the condition laid down in his earlier works, and already referred to in these pages, for the fruitfulness of ecclesiastical ordinances, "that the people shall not be unduly restrained by forms; that they shall be allowed and encouraged to vent their warm devotional feelings in such external acts and gestures as naturally express them, not be bound by harsh and cruel custom to an exterior of polite indifference, and a cold, cramping, and stifling uniformity."

The Ideal of a Church in its several relations to the poor, to the rich, to the State, follows. The Church, as the home of the poor, was a conception ever most attractive to him, "First," he writes, "I will consider those, far the dearest objects of affection to the Church, as to her heavenly master, the little ones of Christ, the poor; that class to whose number belonged the Apostles, St. Mary, our blessed Lord Himself; that class whom He begins by pronouncing blessed; that class whom He vouchsafed to single out from the rest, and say that to them the Gospel was preached." The Ideal of a Church in keeping ever unspotted by the smallest stain the principle of Christian equality, protecting the weak and redressing their wrongs, refusing to bend before the proud and powerful, or to recognise as real greatness that which has in it no moral element, is brought forward in this connection:—

"When we bear in mind the appalling denunciations against wealth which we read in Scripture, how marked and authoritative an attitude should we not expect such a Church to assume in her dealings with this class of her children! how urgent and impressive her admonitions to them to place no trust in those riches, but to live as 'poor in spirit.'"

The partly unconscious deference paid to wealth and position in the English Church, not indeed in outward formalities, for of this he did not deny the seemliness, but in the actual feeling and practice of the average clergy, was specially obnoxious to him. It was the surrender of the sense of true Christian greatness; and he believed the danger of ministers of the Church not having a sufficient sense of their right position in this respect to be all the greater from the subtlety of the fault.

"It is very much more difficult," he says, "to prevent ourselves

from being dazzled and carried away by rank and station than might have been supposed; insomuch that he who is not conscious of the difficulty gives great ground for fearing that he is very deeply plunged in sin. To feel as much abhorrence for the callous selfishness and insensibility of the rich as for the peevishness, querulousness, and discontent of the poor; for the luxurious self-indulgence of the one as for the more coarse and brutal sensuality of the other; for indolent and slothful waste of time and talents in the former, as for confirmed laziness in the latter; this is an achievement which few of us perhaps (even though knowing the importance of the object) have at all adequately reached. I am not speaking of our outward demeanour, which ought of course to differ according to the difference of rank of those whom we address; but of inward sentiment in regard to plain matters of right and wrong. And very few have any idea, until they have thought of the subject, to how wonderful an extent their judgments in such matters are distorted by the presence or absence of worldly and adventitious advantages."[1]

In dealing with the State, too, the Ideal Church must be no time-server, but must be prepared to remonstrate on occasion with those in power:—

"She will feel it her duty to proclaim aloud the general application of Christian principles to political government; and plain undeniable sins, such as flagrant unjust war, or a measure conspicuously oppressive to the poor, she will fearlessly denounce. Against sinful government of a less glaring and overt character, she will not be sparing in her secret but urgent remonstrances; nor will she consider it any derogation whatever from her proper functions to direct her children in the wise employment of such constitutional privileges as may be entrusted to them, with the view of obtaining amelioration or redress. The office of protecting the poor against wrong is especially her own; nor will she consider any one of her attributes more noble, precious, or inalienable. But, on the other hand, should the civil power appear actuated by a real desire to govern religiously and well, she will herself set the example to all her children of the most dutiful and reverential loyalty. She will still reserve it as her high privilege to represent in detail and with earnestness the distresses and sufferings of the poor to those governors who, as she believes, are so willing and desirous to alleviate them, but will, in that case, submit her judgment on the appropriate remedies to the bearers of the temporal sword."[2]

I have now reviewed with tolerable completeness the general principles as to the office and character of the Ideal

[1] P. 112. [2] P. 49.

Church which Mr. Ward advocates in his book. Passing to his application of those principles to the existing state of the Church of England on the one hand, and the Church of Rome on the other, we find an unsparing rigour in his criticisms of the shortcomings of the former Church, alike in the matter of ascetic discipline, of the ideal of sanctity, of systematic moral theology, and of definite dogmatic teaching. His absolute openness in the expression of his opinions he defends at length, and I shall presently quote passages from his explanation.

But the intensity of the opinions themselves might at first sight carry a false impression of wanton exaggeration—though the careful reader will gather its explanation from incidental remarks here and there. It has been said of him that he was an extraordinarily close, candid, and accurate observer of his own character and needs, but had little power of entering into minds unlike his own. He wrote, consequently, chiefly for himself, and those like himself. He was, as he says in the *Ideal*, "by temperament open to the eruptions of speculative doubt," and could enter fully into sceptical difficulties. Again, the irregularity of life, the listlessness and idleness, the periods of indevoutness, the absorbing love of amusement to which his ill-health and temperament made him liable, were his great difficulties in the spiritual life. And both these classes of difficulty called especially for active doctrinal and ascetic guidance, for definite rules of conduct and authoritative definitions of faith.

Persons who, with much less of devotion to religion, accepted their hereditary creed without question, and performed the duties of the day with readiness, who were naturally orderly and exact, did not come within the scope of his observation. He might admit their existence, but he did not realise their circumstances—and at all events their situation did not inspire his writings. He did not understand them enough to prescribe for them. The existing English Church might for such persons be, from this point of view, a comparatively natural and suitable home. And again, persons little given to speculation might lead a life of practical usefulness and devotion, without realising the evil results of the principles which Mr. Ward condemned, or even maintaining in words principles which their conduct contradicted. Mr. Ward allows all this parenthetically; and it is

obvious that for such persons an unmeasured denunciation of a Church which by his own confession contained most excellent and God-fearing members, would seem exaggerated, eccentric, and unreal. A Church meant to them little more than a body of men, and a collection of ordinances appealing to their higher nature and religious feelings.

But to Mr. Ward the realisation of principles was part of his habitual life, and the necessity of an external guide for faith and religious practice was paramount. That careful self-discipline which he maintained to be in a measure necessary for all, he felt to be most necessary for himself. Those principles which tended on the one side to scepticism, and on the other to passivity in religion, in him led straight to their full results. And further, he held that however slowly, and through however many intermediate stages of inconsistency, principles *do* in the long run issue in their full consequences for the world at large. The spirit of free-inquiry which was now advocated by God-fearing men like Arnold and his pupil Stanley, would *in time* develop into the universal questioning of all religious truth. The elements of Lutheranism and Calvinism to be found among Evangelicals might not be inconsistent with the piety of Cecil, or Martyn, or Scott, and yet they contained the seeds of Emotionalism in religion, and of divorce of religion from morality, which might issue in the excesses of the Methodist love-meetings, and give a colourable justification to the cry of modern Agnostics that Christianity has not been the preserver but the destroyer of the moral ideal, that salvation and not morality is its object.

Such is the attitude Mr. Ward assumes throughout. He cries out vehemently against *principles*, whose terrible results were so invisible at the time that the cry seemed to some almost grotesque from its intensity. He saw that it would be so, and felt that it was only the few who would understand him. He did not write, he said, for "that multitude of men who have neither great moral sensitiveness nor great intellectual keenness"; but rather for "those more consistent spirits who in every generation determine most certainly for good or evil the character of the following generation." And this being so, he adds later, "I have endeavoured throughout to speak respectfully and charitably of individuals, but plainly and distinctly of

principles. Of two principles especially which may be considered the distinguishing characteristics of the Reformation, whether here or abroad,—I mean the Lutheran doctrine of Justification and the principle of private judgment,—I have argued that in their abstract nature and necessary tendency they sink below Atheism itself." And the same personal experience of the results of those principles which identified free inquiry with infidelity, and a religion of emotion with the abandonment of the moral law, filled him with horror at a Church-system which not only neglected the enforcement of ascetic religion, but openly tolerated the two fatal principles within her pale. If he was right, the tendencies at work within the English Church would ultimately lead to the subversion of religion, natural and revealed, and no terms could be too strong when used in condemnation of forces of such a nature. "I cannot but hope," he writes, "that many statements, when viewed in their proper place and connection with reference to such a view, may appear even to those wholly unprepared to receive them, as not destitute of reason and probability, which might of themselves, without such explanation, most naturally convey the impression of being wild, violent, and eccentric, of being introduced in a spirit of wantonness, and maintained in a spirit of exaggeration."

The actual controversy which had led him to write was, it will be remembered, Mr. Palmer's attack on his articles in the *British Critic*. He accepts to the full that writer's adverse account of his views.

"I beg most distinctly to say," he writes, "that I have no personal complaint whatever to make against Mr. Palmer; on the contrary, that his quotations from my articles have been on the whole perfectly fair, and that in using the severe language which he has adopted concerning them he has been performing that which according to his theological views was even a duty."

And he would not allow that others whose articles had likewise been criticised in the *Narrative* were in any degree responsible for the bad impression produced by the *British Critic*, for which he considered himself alone to blame.

"I mentioned at starting," he says, "that it is no business of mine to defend the works of other writers, but I cannot forbear

from adding here that the other articles in the *British Critic* seem to me so carefully and habitually deferential towards our Church, that I cannot fancy they would have been accused of an unsettling or 'disturbing' tendency, had they not been coloured in the reader's mind by the tone or expressions of my own articles."

Referring more directly to the outspoken tone which characterises the work throughout, and of his reasons for its adoption, he gives a home thrust at those Churchmen who had been filled with pious indignation at the reserve of Tract 90—who had stigmatised it as disingenuous and Jesuitical.

"When certain persons desire by all allowable methods," he writes, "to 'unprotestantise the National Church,' to supplant one dominant principle by its contradictory, granting the lawfulness of the desire (which is not the present question), it is very far from easy to discover what is and what is not the mode of proceeding likely to carry with it the least of permanent evil. Nothing in the whole world can be more unreasonable, however natural, than the respective complaints that are made. We use open and straightforward expressions; we are condemned loudly as hurrying persons forward prematurely, startling, alarming them, and the like: we write in a more reserved and cautious style; suspicions are insinuated of dishonesty, underhand dealing, nay, positive mendacity. The substance of what we advocate is so extremely displeasing to many around us that the manner, really, I think, hardly receives the credit due to it. However, as I have reason to think, from what I hear and see, that few writings have perplexed and alarmed religious and excellent men more than my own articles in the *British Critic*, I do hope that it may tend to restore peace and quietness of mind, if I state, with the utmost attainable openness, what I have meant (and do mean) and what I have not. Accordingly, if anything which follows shall appear unnecessarily uncouth and offensive to existing prepossessions, let it be attributed to my earnest desire of expressing myself frankly and intelligibly."

A little later he says in reference to the same subject:—

"An objection has been taken to my *tone* . . . a word has been used in a private communication which I have not seen in print, but which expresses the sort of feeling; it has been said, then, that [my protests] appear couched not in sorrowful but in 'spiteful' terms. I think I perceive what that element is in them which has given rise to such a feeling, and I humbly trust that it is neither wrong nor unbecoming. In the first place, most certainly it does not show that what appear to me the corruptions in question give me no pain. For years, consciously or not, and in various shapes not recognised by me at the time as modifications of the same

symptoms, had my feelings been oppressed and (I may really say) tortured by this heavy, unspiritual, unelastic, prosaic, unfeeling, unmeaning Protestant spirit; all this time my ears were stunned with the din of self-laudation, with the words 'pure and apostolical,' 'evangelical truth and apostolical order,' and the like most miserable watchwords; those from whom I learned at one moment some high and elevating truth, at the next crushed and overwhelmed me by some respectful mention of our existing system; with the single exception of Mr. Froude's work, no external response could I find to my ceaseless and ever-increasing inward repugnance against the habits of thought and action prevalent in our Church. At length I was able to fix with some definiteness on the particular cause of my annoyance; and soon afterwards (in writing two pamphlets three years ago) I had the opportunity of speaking out. To say that the hearty and energetic tone in which I did speak out indicates my real feeling of sorrow to have been shallow and trifling, is an allegation which I will meet with a parallel case. Let us suppose any one to have been afflicted by some most painful illness for many weeks, but to have been compelled to restrain his outcries hitherto, because of dangerous illness in the next house: the impediment being removed, he cries out with no subdued tone, and with great relief of mind; on which he is accosted by a stranger with the observation, 'Sir, your pain cannot be very serious, or you would not cry out with so good a heart and with such evident satisfaction.' And secondly, I trust that allowing myself to speak in such a tone was not in itself wrong or unbecoming. When the evils to which one desires to draw attention are facts whose existence has hitherto been unknown, all men's natural feelings conspire with the obvious rule of right, and the communication is made in a sorrowful and subdued spirit. But when the facts have been known from the first, but not recognised to be evils, then I conceive that words of zealous, indignant, declamatory remonstrance are generally allowable, and often the most fitting of all possible methods."

He defends the loyalty of his intentions towards the English Church in the following characteristic passage:—

"Mr. Palmer has shown, by unanswerable evidence, what I can hardly fancy any one reading one of my articles without discovering, and what on occasion I have asserted in terms, viz. that on a great number of points I conceive that the English Church would act wisely in making Rome her model; whereas he has merely assumed what was the real point at issue, that such an opinion argues want of patriotism in an English Churchman. Yet in parallel cases we find the very opposite held universally. No one would call an American of the present day unpatriotic because he very much indeed prefers the state of things which existed before

the revolt, and because he is anxious to do his utmost in restoring, if possible, constitutional monarchy. An Englishman is not patriotic in that he believes and propagates the belief of an Englishman beating ten Frenchmen, but in that he makes England the sphere and centre of his energies, loves to study the feelings, habits, opinions of Englishmen, and brings whatever knowledge he possesses of other countries to bear upon his favourite subject of thought; is more pained by the vices and more delighted by the virtues of Englishmen than by those of Frenchmen, Germans, or Italians. I am not attempting to decide how far we are justified in allowing patriotism to supersede universal philanthropy; all acknowledge that we are in some degree, and all acknowledge that we are not entirely; but so far forth as we are patriotic, so far have we such sentiments as I have just described. But on the other hand, to intoxicate ourselves with insular pride, to bury ourselves in the thought of England's real or supposed excellences, to be blind to her failings, and to believe, even in the utmost simplicity of heart, that she is the envy of surrounding nations, an eighth wonder of the world, this is no real patriotism; it is at bottom but base pride and vulgar nationality."

One more quotation is requisite to give a true idea of the spirit in which the work is written. The one accusation which had given him pain in this case, as in the case of his *Few Words in Defence of Tract 90*, was that of moral self-sufficiency—of criticising the Establishment as an inadequate sphere for the exercise of his own spiritual attainments. His own feeling was on the contrary, to an intense degree, that it is those who are least advanced in spirituality who most stand in need of a system for their guidance and help; and that in moral as in artistic progress rules are absolutely necessary for the mass of students who have no special aptitude or have insufficient experience, while they may be in a great measure dispensed with after their work in fixing habits of mind and action is completed. He criticised the Anglican Church from an intellectual point of view with zest and confidence for the inconsistency of her position and organisation, and he was prepared to maintain his criticism. But in the matter of her moral character and discipline he did not profess to sit in judgment. He had stood to her in the relation of disciple and not of teacher; and he complained not that she did not correspond with his high spiritual attainments, but that she had failed to teach a weak though willing pupil.

"In a word," he writes, "the charge of intellectual presumption to any extent (though I trust that it is not deserved) will give me very little pain or uneasiness; but should it be imagined that the free strictures and confident opinions in which I may indulge imply any arrogation to myself of moral superiority over those whom I criticise; should it be imagined that when I acknowledge the English system to be in many particulars uncongenial to my own feelings, I allude to the impediments by which it thwarts the aspirations of a holy mind towards saintliness, rather than the absence of such helps as may support an erring and sinful mind in the most ordinary path of salvation; should this be imagined, I should be almost overpowered with shame and confusion."

The practical portion of the book hinges mainly upon two points—his criticisms of the existing Anglican system, and his intimations that the Church of Rome is, in his opinion, to a great extent the natural guide and model for its reformation. In the first of these points he is concerned with contrasting the Anglican establishment with the primitive Church, in its doctrines, discipline, and ideals, with a view to securing the co-operation of the whole High Church party in the work of reform. He presses to their consequences the Catholic principles professed by the whole party, and urges on them the necessity of working in unison, in spite of their differences in matters of detail, in the work of unprotestantising the National Church. Leave the results, he pleads, in God's hands. Do not shrink from restoring Catholicism because you hear it said that such a course will lead to popery. Be true to yourselves and your principles, and if popery be false, be sure that the Catholic reformation will stop short of it, whereas if in the long run the Catholic principles you prize so much *must* lead to popery, you may be sure that when you have approached nearer to such an issue by conscientious obedience to those principles, you will view popery, which is now your *bête noire*, with very different eyes. Work with us in raising the Church's ascetic tone. Keep, if you please, to primitive devotions and practices; abstain from foreign customs which are uncongenial to you; but work practically in the Established Church for the restoration of the principles of faith and obedience, for the destruction of the Lutheran spirit of self-righteousness and passivity; for the practical realisation of those Catholic doctrines which are presupposed in the Anglican Prayer-book.

So far the *Ideal* had a really practical aim, and its aim was equally practical in the effort Ward made, correlatively to his exhortation, to point out the "degradation," from the Catholic standpoint, of the existing Anglican system. He endeavoured to show what a long way it had to go to arrive at any approximation to the Catholic ideal; how, at a time when the uprooting of old-fashioned principles, political, moral, philosophical, and the consequent anarchy of thought and of life which reigned—a legacy in part from the French Revolution—clamoured for the offices of a Church, of a high-souled spiritual teacher, which should chasten men's hearts, attract their affections, give rest and assurance to their intellect, the English Church was not only found wanting, but seemed as unconscious of the danger as of her own inability to meet it. The best sign, he maintained, of real religious life in a Church was consciousness of its shortcomings, and of its constant need for reform. In a Church, as with an individual, self-righteousness must mean blindness, and humility was the condition of spiritual light and heat. The self-satisfaction then of the English Church, its arrogation to itself of especial purity, its serene unconsciousness of the dangers to faith which modern thought was bringing, or of its own want of vital strength for the meeting of those dangers,—all this was the worst of omens at starting, and the best justification *a priori* for the very unfavourable view he took of her condition and prospects. The Roman Church claimed no such purity as a local Church. The holy See indeed, as mouthpiece of the Church Universal, claimed to preserve the truths of revelation; but in Rome itself, as elsewhere, constant humiliation and confession of sin and shortcoming—of the evils of the times and the corruptions of the place—were held to be conditions of moral health. In England alone the spirit of self-righteousness had so taken possession of the Church as alike to intimate a wide spread of unconscious corruption, and to call for loud and energetic protests as the only means of arousing its slumbering consciousness of sin.

And of what nature were the corruptions and shortcomings in question? He denied that they consisted merely in want of life and spiritual energy,—a want which led her ministers to neglect their duties or the practice of what they preached.

Such faults may be found at any time, however pure the doctrine and perfect the professed system of a Church. But with the English Church there was, he maintained, a far deeper source of corruption on the moral side, while her intellectual position was hopelessly anomalous. The source of her moral corruption was the more or less conscious, and more or less complete adoption in its pale of the principle of private judgment, and the Lutheran spirit of which I have already spoken. The source of the intellectual confusion to be found in her position and formularies was in part a wholly indefensible past history, beginning with the time when she assumed the right to separate herself in life and creed from the rest of Christendom, and in part the conflicting views tolerated within her pale during the period of her separate existence. Two parties—the one approaching near in essentials to Roman Catholics, the other to dissenters,—opposed to each other far more than to the external bodies I have mentioned—existed in the Anglican Church, and each had its share in determining her formularies. The result was that opposite views as to the nature and offices of a Church, as to the rule of faith, as to the true ethical ideal, as to innumerable matters of doctrine and practice, were embodied in the public documents and official records of one Church. It was declared to be at the same time a branch of the Catholic Church and a state establishment of Protestants; subject to the descendants of the Apostles and the servant of the civil ruler; representing the Christianity of the fathers, and rejecting their views for the pure and Apostolical Christianity of the Reformation; regarding the Church as visible and invisible; in its view of orders, of the Eucharist, of Justification, affirming in one word what it denied in the next; Protestant for the most part in its articles, and Catholic in its Prayer-book.

And this intellectual confusion in its turn reacted upon its moral tone. Those Protestant doctrines which affirmed justification by faith, the principle of private judgment, the rejection of the saints of the Church as fanatics, of the ideal of monasticism as fanatical, were all part of a certain general spirit, and that spirit was to some extent abroad within the English Church, affecting even those who adhered to the High Church or Catholic party. The spirit of self-denial, beginning in

humble obedience to conscience, and culminating in enthusiastic self-prostration and self-effacement for the love of God, formed a coherent moral ideal. One part depended on another. Reject the idea of the union between austerity and sanctity, and you have mortally wounded the whole of the Catholic spirituality. So too the spirit of faith involved a whole chain of consequences. Admit individual private judgment as to the letter of the Scripture, and you have mortally wounded the very basis on which Christian belief is reared. In both cases the Protestant principle involved a compromise with the world—a hesitation in carrying out the unearthly ideal of the Christian religion, which was fatal, in proportion as it was realised, to its life and influence.

War was, then, to be made on the principles of the Reformation. Consistent High Churchmen should recognise this—or at least if they maintained, as Dr. Pusey did, that the English Reformation was not anti-Catholic, they must recognise that uncompromising war is to be waged against that Protestant spirit which has gained a footing in the Church whenever and however. Let all High Churchmen unite in this. Let them labour for the restoration of the Catholic character of the Church, and above all of such ascetic discipline as will raise her moral tone and expel the Lutheran and Evangelical spirit from her pale.

So far, as I have said, Mr. Ward's book had a practical aim in which High Churchmen might unite. When, however, he proceeds to ask the question—how are the shortcomings of the English Church to be remedied, his answer was so unpalatable to all but his own immediate followers that it served only to put on record frankly his own views and plans. Briefly, the remedy for her defects as a moral educator was imitation of the Roman Church, and the cure for her wavering and contradictory teaching was to study the official and obligatory teaching of the Papal see. He did not, indeed, as we have already seen, urge any immediate adoption of either, and he repeatedly disclaimed any wish to enforce practices or doctrines for which Englishmen were unprepared; but still he intimated plainly his own opinion that assistance in the work of restoration was to be looked for in this one quarter, and that although it was not the immediate duty of individuals to conform to the Roman

model, *ultimate* conformity to it would be the natural result of following out their principles, while the study of Roman doctrine and ascetics would show them that its main features were identical with that primitive Catholicism which they were labouring to restore. That such was his view he thought it right to own publicly, and to anticipate and obviate the charge that he was instilling popery into the Church unawares. Still he urged on his fellow High Churchmen to leave this result to be decided by the event; to refrain from any Roman practices and doctrines which did not commend themselves to their conscience, content only to allow liberty all round—the moderate holding less, the extreme holding more—and thus to let the whole body of the "Movement" party move forward freely and act for some years together, at the end of which time he held that the free and unchecked development of thought in individuals would be found to have brought the great bulk of them into far closer accord with Rome.

Finally, he justified his position with reference to the Roman Church from the very fact that he was confident that the Movement was towards Rome, and that the attitude of the party was not heretical or separatist, but rather tending to reunion and submission as soon as it was practicable.

Such is the main argument of the *Ideal*, so far as it deals with the crisis which had given rise to its production and the existing state of the English Church. Of the general style of its composition enough specimens have been given. It remains to cite some of the stronger and most characteristic expressions of opinion, in admiration of Rome and detestation of the English system, which are scattered here and there throughout the work.

His impatience at the lack of intellectual consistency in the formularies of the English Church, in its practical teaching, and in the rule of faith advocated for individuals within its pale, may be instanced by the following quotations. He expresses himself as unable to attach "any sense whatever to those often-repeated words 'teaching of the English Church,'" and proceeds:—

"That the phrase 'teaching of the Prayer-book' conveys a definite and important meaning I do not deny; considering that it is mainly a selection from the Breviary, it is not surprising that the

Prayer-book should on the whole breathe a uniform, most edifying, deeply orthodox spirit; a spirit which corresponds to one particular body of doctrine, and not to its contradictory. Again, that the phrase 'teaching of the Articles' conveys a definite meaning I cannot deny; for (excepting the four first, which belong to the old theology) they also breathe a uniform intelligible spirit. But then these respective spirits are not different merely, but absolutely contradictory; as well could a student in the heathen schools have imbibed at once the Stoic and Epicurean philosophies, as could a humble member of our Church at the present time learn his creed both from Prayer-book and Articles. . . .

"But even were the formularies of our Church accordant instead of discordant, urgent instead of wavering, definite instead of vague, still so long as her practical teaching is in the highest degree uncertain, conflicting, and contradictory; when members of our Church seem hardly to agree in one matter of positive opinion that can be named, except the purity of our Church; and when, even as to that, each party maintains that our Church would be most *im*pure if she taught doctrines which the other party strenuously contends she *does* teach; I can see no possible defence for the position 'that her formularies, in their *primâ facie* bearing, demand implicit reception from her children.' Surely, until she is able so far to invigorate her discipline as that one and one only doctrine in essentials can be taught within her pale, she can have no warrant in making this demand. How can that sacredness and divine authority which attaches to our first instructors be fairly claimed for the English formularies in their natural sense, when in point of fact they are not our first instructors? It is the creed of our parents which first introduces us to the creed of our Church, and colours the latter with its own hues. And when our moral development has compelled us to desert that creed, those do not fairly challenge our adherence who give to our formularies their most *literal* sense, but those who give to them that sense which promises most fairly as a rest and satisfaction to that development." [1]

In his own case, as we have seen, this sense was that which is most in accord with the teaching of the Church Universal, and that Church was represented by the official teaching of the see of Rome. To other High Churchmen it might be a Catholicism less developed than this. Anyhow, this must be the principle of an English Churchman's belief if he is to have any hope of a progressive or consistent religious life. A literal acceptance of fresh statements in *opposition* to the living creed

[1] See p. 70.

one has already accepted, and sees no reason to doubt, is impossible—unless, indeed, the author of those statements is deemed infallible, and the earlier creed is thereby ruled to be false. But the existence of an infallible teacher is absolutely denied by English Churchmen, high as well as low.

"The Roman Catholics, indeed, generally say that Christians are, in matters of doctrine, bound to receive implicitly the decrees of St. Peter's Chair; but those who so think, think also that, by a Divine promise, that Chair is infallibly saved from teaching error. But to reject the doctrine of the Church's infallibility as a figment, to proclaim as a great and glorious truth that all bishops are but fallible men, and that the chief bishop on earth sanctions, nay, practises idolatry; and at the same time to call for implicit deference and submission to the doctrinal statements of a certain small body of bishops who are indefinitely at variance with each other, and who, according to Mr. Palmer's own theory, are separated off from the great body of the Catholic Church; this is a flight of conservative extravagance, an assumption of spiritual despotism, which can find no parallel beyond the circle of Anglican 'High Churchmen.'" [1]

Next, as to the shortcomings of the English Church in her practical action and in her appliances for moral discipline, his indignation is pointed by her absolute satisfaction with her own performances, which seems, in his eyes, to call for the most unqualified indictment.

"To speak plainly," he writes, "believing, as I most firmly do, that ever since the schism of the sixteenth century the English Church has been swayed by a spirit of arrogance, self-contentment, and self-complacency, resembling rather an absolute infatuation than the imbecility of ordinary pride, which has stifled her energies, crippled her resources, frustrated all the efforts of her most devoted children to raise her from her existing degradation, I for one, however humble my position, will not be responsible for uttering one word or implying one opinion which shall tend to foster so outrageous a delusion."

And, true to this promise, he devotes a chapter to "Our existing practical corruptions," the tone of which may be inferred from the headings of its several sections—"Absence of all system of moral discipline for the poor," "Absence of all system of moral discipline for the rich," "Our Church's total

[1] Pp. 72-73.

neglect of her duties as guardian of and witness to morality," "Our Church's total neglect of her duties as witness and teacher of orthodoxy," "Powerlessness of our Church to perform her other duties, especially that of protecting and helping the poor, while these are neglected," and so forth.

This indictment is supported by contrasting the machinery of Anglicanism with the practical system of the Roman Church—a standard which naturally English Churchmen would not accept, but which once accepted made the evidence overwhelming. Once it was allowed that constant systematic and ascetic training of the will was the proper office of the Church, that such training strengthened more than it cramped the soul, while its absence led in most cases to various degrees of laxity of conscience rather than to freer and more acceptable works done according to the spirit, the English Church stood condemned. And this was Mr. Ward's starting point. Christianity was a remedial religion; constant laborious training of the will and affections in order to make God, sin, judgment, eternity, realities to the human mind—prone as it was to earthly rather than heavenly thoughts since the fall—was the great work of the Church in the world. With abundant quotations from recognised works, this aspect of the Roman Catholic Church is exhibited, and the absence of similar provisions in the English Church pointed out. Meditation—to make the truths of religion realities to the imagination, constant examination of conscience that sin may not be passed over or forgotten, occasional retreats as a fresh start after neglect, the literature of ascetic theology and hagiology to stimulate in the service of God by example and precept, the Confessional for advice and consolation, moral theology to save priests from caprice and give them the benefit in advising their penitents of the experience of the Corporate Church,—here are the spiritual weapons of the Church of Rome; and where, he asked, can we find their counterpart in England?[1]

In this connection he dwells on the power of the Confessional as a tribunal, bringing before the rich, amid the

[1] At the end of this chapter is given in full an account of the rule of life in a French Ecclesiastical Seminary which Ward quotes to point the contrast between the spiritual training of French priests and English clergymen. It was sent to him by the Rector of the Seminary in question.

luxury of temporal power and independence, their true position as Christians, reminding them of the awful dangers they incur, and correlatively protecting the poor from their tyranny.

"Let us place before our minds the ideal picture of a wealthy man, encrusted in all that intense pride and selfishness which so naturally results from the unlimited power of gratifying his wishes, and from his habit of seeing all men and things around him placed at his disposal. Conceive him kneeling before a humble priest, praying for absolution at his hands, answering his questions on the habits of his daily life, receiving stern rebukes or earnest exhortations; who can fail to see that this is the very medicine suited to his disease, the very moral discipline which may at least make a beginning of that necessary task (and the beginning is proverbially the most difficult part of any task), the gradual overthrow of his antichristian habits and principles. Well, the English Church has destroyed this discipline; what has she substituted in its place? She can *not* destroy the unparalleled denunciations found in Scripture against the rich as a class; and she professes herself pre-eminently a Scriptural Church; in what single particular does her practical system recognise those denunciations? It has been profoundly observed by Mr. Froude that obedience to spiritual rulers is the same trial to the rich that obedience to temporal rulers is to the poor; but our Church has sunk all claim to the former in her earnest and repeated inculcation of the latter; she has given up that part of the ancient system, then, which bore hardly on the rich, and added new strength to that which bears hardly on the poor. This does not seem in accordance with the Scriptural model.

"There is no particular in which the depraving effect of riches is more signally displayed than the habit of mind whereby the wealthy man tends unconsciously to consider the poorer classes of society almost as beings of a different nature from himself; to fancy that they are bound from their very position to labour incessantly for his convenience and enjoyment, while he incurs from *his* position no corresponding duty of self-denying labour for *their* benefit. The only effective manner, of course, in which a Church can possibly witness against, and tend to remedy this miserable sin, is by displaying the opposite principle in the most lively and energetic manner in her own practical action; by showing, in a manner not to be mistaken, how dear to her are the poor, with what sympathy she regards their sorrows, with what consummate wisdom, with what ungrudging devotedness of purpose, she labours for their removal. That this cannot be said of our own Church at present, with the most distant approach to truth, seems now pretty generally acknowledged. On her, then, far more than on any other

body (as professing to *be* the National Church), lies the grave and serious responsibility of that wide gulf of separation between rich and poor; that contrast of selfish and careless neglect on one side, with the union of rankling suspicion and hollow, cowardly servility on the other; which (whatever honourable exceptions may exist) is now so actively and increasingly mischievous throughout our social system."[1]

Again he writes:—

"It has been so generally professed of late years that a Christian society is bound to be a 'poor man's Church,' and that it is the high and peculiar prerogative of the Church to alleviate the misery of the humble and oppressed, that the task seems incumbent on me, however ungracious, of estimating the praises heaped on the English system by this standard also. Let me ask, then, while all the frightful and accumulated mass of misery which now oppresses our land was gradually, during the last sixty years, growing to a head, where was the voice of the National Church heard in drawing attention to its growth? That the civil government, who are obliged to cope day by day with present and passing emergencies, should not have had the leisure or the thought to take a deliberate and far-seeing view of our social condition—this is hardly a matter of blame; but where was the 'poor man's Church'? How is it conceivable that she can at that time have really thought or cared for the poor without becoming cognisant of the fatal disease in progress, and loudly proclaiming its existence to the country and to the world? What other appellation than that of 'grossly and miserably corrupt' can we give to a system under which such monstrous neglect was so much as possible? Well, at length, through no agency of hers, the attention of the whole nation *has* been called in some insufficient measure to the peril under which we lie; all honour to Lord Ashley and his precursors and coadjutors in that noble task! Has the English Church at least exhibited the grace of humiliation or repentance? Has the blush of shame been visible on her cheek? Have her ministers sorrowfully and contritely confessed their unpardonable and sinful dereliction of duty, and taken on themselves bitter shame as fact after fact was brought to light?—facts which it was their bounden duty long since to have dragged into the face of day, and which place in still stronger colours the godlessness and depravity of vast portions of her flock. Incredible as it might have appeared, the very conception would seem never to have occurred to them; with unruffled brow and complacent voice they have still repeated their insane watchwords, 'pure and apostolical,' 'holy and venerable' Church, and have dared to speak of the corruptions of other Christian bodies, when they

[1] Pp. 373-374.

should rather have been in lowly and penitential abasement, mourning those of their own." [1]

But the general want of moral activity in the Church—whether in such quasi-political duties as those just referred to, or generally in energetic moral training—he attributes primarily to the influence of the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith only. The spirit breathed by that doctrine, he holds, tends in every department to make religion a matter of feeling rather than of duty, of subjective and passive emotionalism rather than of energetic discipline of the will. "That doctrine," he writes, "formally denies the truth which seems to me the key to all moral and religious knowledge, and which I mentioned as the leading idea of the present work; the truth, namely, that careful moral discipline is the necessary foundation whereon alone Christian faith [and practice] can be reared."

He devotes a chapter to the consideration of the doctrine in question, both in the abstract and in its effect on the English Church in the concrete. It is not, he holds, fully accepted by many, but it has tainted existing Anglicanism. It is professed especially by the Evangelical party, but is found among them side by side with the truly religious spirit which their habits of prayer and study of the Scriptures cannot fail to beget. The inconsistency between the two—between the godly "fear and trembling" which they learn from Scripture and the assurance of salvation preached by Luther, between the idea of "working out their salvation" and that of a salvation already secured by believing it to be secured, and so forth with other doctrines—leads to a peculiar confusion in their doctrinal statements, and an unreality in the use of them. I subjoin some specimens of his language on this point.

First, as to the *practical* temper of mind of Evangelicals, he allows that they do own to principles which are opposed to Luther's view. An Evangelical adopts Luther's *language*, but not to the full his view, and hence a medley of ideas, and a divorce of phrases from their natural meaning. "No one substantive idea is in his mind," he writes, "distinguishing him from the orthodox, but only a confused medley of conflicting

[1] Pp. 420-421.

and inconsistent ideas, drawing him, one this way one that; some leading in all consistency to sanctity in the fullest sense, some leading in all consistency to wickedness of the deepest dye. He has no *idea* which he can recognise as his characteristic mark, and so is obliged to constitute as such the stiff stereotyped adoption of certain strange uncouth expressions." "These expressions are," he says, "*cant* terms and phrases; the fluent and familiar enumeration of which seems considered by multitudes an almost unfailing note of spirituality, and the absence of which is taken as *quite* an unfailing note of worldliness." So far as he can unravel the Evangelical position from its inconsistencies of expression, he explains it as follows:—

"[Evangelicals] seem in general very remarkably unwilling to confess that [sanctity] consists in unreserved submission, even in the smallest particulars, to the will of God; nay, they seem unconsciously to regard such a view of it (fearful to say) as legal or Jewish. There is perhaps nothing which so forcibly brings home to one's mind the close affinity of Lutheranism to antichrist as this most truly observable circumstance. If it is possible to analyse their way of looking at things it would appear that they regard complete independence of God's will as worldliness or carnality, complete and (so to speak) abject dependence on it as superstition, legality, and monkery; that they consider true Christianity to consist in a certain *via media* whereby in very important matters our will goes spontaneously in the same direction with God's will; in other matters we follow our own will without fear or responsibility, but in neither case are we called on to *submit* our own to His."

Of the abstract Lutheran doctrine, apart from its modified concrete exhibitions, he writes in yet stronger terms.

He charges it with separating entirely the idea of being acceptable to God on the one hand, and the ideas of personal holiness and moral effort on the other. It enunciates, he says, "two grand heretical paradoxes—(1) that the news of forgiveness of sins can convey peace to the afflicted soul before holiness is implanted, or, in other words, that man's misery in his natural state is fear of punishment only and not consciousness of sin; and (2) that such news of forgiveness, if really apprehended, will lead without pains or trouble on our part to obedience and holiness, or, in other words, that self-denial is antichristian."

On these principles he comments as follows:—

"In the Catholic Church, from first to last, there has been one

and one only consistent type of the interior life. The Christian pilgrim has felt himself placed in this world in the midst of a severe and unceasing conflict, his demeanour under which determines his lot hereafter; contending for a prize which needs all his efforts to secure it; climbing up towards it by a severe and rugged path (certain, indeed, of saving him, be he true to himself and faithful to God's guidance, yet so arduous that sluggishness or self-security will be certain ruin); surrounded on all sides by supernatural agencies, evil angels assailing him, good angels supporting him; a spectacle in his struggles to the whole heavenly court; gifted, indeed, by God with blessings the most ineffable and transporting even here, even in his pilgrimage, yet but faint foretastes these of the far greater bliss in store for him when he shall reach his Home; every suffering rightly endured, every exertion daringly and religiously ventured, increase, as he feels, the reward purchased for him by One who 'first bore His own cross,' a cross infinitely heavier and more grievous than He has laid on any that follow Him. Apostles, prophets, saints of the early, of the mediæval, of the later Church, whatever . . . differences they may have had in their *objective* theology (differences, however, in no way affecting the highest object of faith), have had this one uniform *subjective* view of the Gospel scheme; and this the Lutheran system cuts down at its very root. For labour cheered by hope it substitutes the listlessness caused by assurance; in the place of *sin* as the one only evil to be dreaded, the one only enemy to be feared, it puts its absurd chimera of 'self-righteousness' (as though there were almost as much danger in obeying too much as too little); for spiritual blessings reaching to the very innermost heart and soul, it speaks of the cold knowledge of our external and forensic pardon; for a noble and sustained triumph over the old man, it has, as it were, peevish and querulous complaints of his power. To speak as if this latter scheme of doctrine were *in itself* otherwise than radically and fundamentally monstrous, immoral, heretical, and antichristian, shows but an inadequate grasp of its *antagonistic* truths.

". . . And in proportion as we believe that this hateful incubus cripples the noblest energies, stifles the loftiest aspirations, oppresses the tenderest feelings of those whom it has claimed as its own, will we from time to time lift up our voice in plain and intelligible warning, if haply its victims may bethink themselves of testing its strange and arbitrary decrees by—we care not what standard which even *professes* to be divine, by Scripture, by conscience, by the voice of the Church." [1]

Further, he plainly intimates his opinion that, quite apart from Christian revelation in any shape, the Lutheran substitu-

[1] Pp. 302-303.

tion of a merely external so-called righteousness for the duty of internal submission of our own will to that of God strikes a blow at the first truths even of natural religion.

"That obedience to the will of God, with whatever sacrifice of self, is the one thing needful; that sin is the one only danger to be dreaded, the one only evil to be avoided; these great truths are the very foundation of natural religion; and inasmuch as this modern system denies those to be *essential* and *necessary* truths, yea, counts it the chief glory of the Gospel that under it they are no longer truths, we must plainly express our conviction that a religious heathen, were he really to accept the doctrine which Lutheran *language* expresses, so far from making any advance, would sustain a heavy loss in exchanging fundamental truth for fundamental error. Our readers must admit that we have never been slow in acknowledging how much of sincerity and self-devotion there has *in fact* been among those who have embraced this heresy, and to how very great an extent, where that has been the case, individual conscientiousness has neutralised the anti-religious infection. But neither may we forget, on the other hand, how miserably also has this same system in its turn crippled and enchained the religious instinct of its victims, and prevented them from carrying that instinct forward to its legitimate development—the Catholic scheme. Hence the inconsistency, both moral and intellectual, which is so surprising a phenomenon among the 'Evangelicals'; surprising, that is, at first sight, but no longer surprising when we regard them as possessed really with religious feelings which draw them *to* Christ, but possessed also by a human traditionary and most un-Scriptural system which draws them directly *from* Him. Hence that feebleness, ambiguity, uncertainty of doctrinal statement, that inequality, unshapeliness, dwarfishness of spiritual stature, which persons at all conversant with Catholic models are so pained and disappointed in finding (with very few exceptions) in what they hear or see of religious Protestants." [1]

These three extracts, published originally in the *British Critic*, are reproduced in the *Ideal*. Further extracts are given, waxing stronger and stronger, moving definitely to the comparatively safe ground of the *abstract* doctrine with its *legitimate logical* tendencies.

"A religious person," he writes, "who shall be sufficiently clear-headed to understand the meaning of words is warranted in rejecting Lutheranism on the very same grounds which would induce him to reject atheism, viz., as being the contra-

[1] Pp. 304-305.

diction of truths which he feels on most certain grounds to be first principles." And again: "If it be true that the idea of duty is more deeply rooted in our nature even than that of God (though it is painful to make such comparisons), a serious result follows in regard to Lutheranism. When we speak of Lutheranism we speak of an abstract doctrine which cannot, we believe, be held consistently even by the devils, but which is held to an alarming extent among Evangelicals, though inconsistently." This *crescendo* from the *British Critic* culminates in the crash of a *fortissimo* in the pages of the *Ideal*, where he winds up by saying: "Speaking still of the same abstract Lutheran doctrine, there is no one circumstance connected with my humble efforts in the *British Critic* on which I look back with so much satisfaction as on this,—that I have ventured to characterise that most hateful and fearful type of antichrist in terms not wholly inadequate to its prodigious demerits."

Finally, as the Lutheran system is the embodiment of that spirit which denies that moral self-discipline is at the root of religion, so the Roman Catholic system is, in his opinion, the embodiment of the spirit which affirms it. In spite of the corruptions of Catholic countries, the Catholic Church has at once preserved the ideal and the machinery which enables those who make use of it to aim at that ideal. He speaks of Rome as "that quarter where my own eyes are always first directed when in search of spiritual wisdom," and of the existing Catholic Church abroad as the "fit model" for the English Church, because "Rome has preserved in the main, and we have not, what is so inestimably precious, the high and true *idea* of a Church; whatever may be the present lukewarmness of her children (of which for myself I really cannot judge nor have ever expressed an opinion), whenever zeal, energy, and piety revive they can act immediately in the Church by *means* of the system they find, while among us they must begin by attacking the system they find."

He gives at great length and in great detail instances of Roman spiritual training, which for the most part require the recognition of no distinctively Roman doctrine over and above what all High Churchmen profess to accept. However, these are given only as suggestions, to be adopted or not according to the individual's bent. What is strenuously contended for

is that *in general* the English Church is wholly wanting in such discipline and the Roman Church abounds in it. "Let us only in some poor measure learn to realise the inveterate corruption of our own system, and the excellent lessons we may learn from the Roman Church towards supplying our deficiencies in such points as these; let this be really acknowledged, and it is hardly possible that the actual introduction of external and formal changes can be too gradually or cautiously made."

Roman doctrine and Roman practice are to be suffered, but not taught. Those who support Rome and those who support the Reformation are each to be free to hold their opinion, combining to purify the Church, and leaving it for events to determine which view of the two a purified Church will ultimately take.

"Let Mr. Isaac Williams," he writes, "if he so please, still publish his opinion that 'human support and human comfort' were needful to St. Mary after our Lord's ascension, while the promise of the Holy Ghost was the sufficient consolation of His disciples; let Dr. Hook continue to call Roman Catholics Mariolaters; let Mr. Wilson exercise his judgment on a Pope's will, and characterise it as almost worthy of a 'railing' censure; but let others have equal liberty, and with no greater remonstrance, to honour St. Mary as the highest and purest of creatures, to regard the Roman Church with affection and reverence, and to hold a Pope's dogmatic decree as at least exempt from our criticism and comment."

Such differences of opinion need not, he holds, interfere with union in the great work. He expresses his admiration for the goodness of many of the moderate party.

"Many of them," he says, "are endued with qualities to which I can lay no sort of claim: ardent and enthusiastic love of God, intense, self-sacrificing, self-forgetting benevolence to man. . . . I have used language of very considerable respect and deference to Archdeacon Manning, Mr. Dodsworth, Mr. Heurtley, Dr. Hook, Dr. Jelf, Mr. Ernest Hawkins, and have in no one instance spoken of such divines in a different tone; and so with regard to the other two writers I just now mentioned; for Mr. Wilson, though most slightly acquainted with him, I entertain feelings of extreme regard and respect; to Mr. Williams I look up with (I trust) singleminded love and reverence."

Let us then, he pleads, combine in impressing upon the Church those habits of religious self-discipline and that saintly

ideal which we agree in reverencing, however much we may differ as to the fact of its natural opposition to the spirit of the Reformation, and union with the spirit of Rome.

"If it be granted," he continues, "that the aiming at such objects as I have ventured to put forward as desirable implies of itself no set purpose of 'Romanising' our Church, I must beg leave to doubt whether any single one of her members entertains any such purpose. For as to secret negotiations and understanding with members of that Church, these and similar rumours, to the best of my own knowledge, are without the very slightest foundation in fact. And surely, if High Churchmen are slow to co-operate in the prosecution of objects which *on their own principles* are desirable, from a fear of the direction in which such a course might tend, they are taking the most effectual way to confirm us in what they consider our most serious error—our belief, namely, that High Church principles, honestly carried out on their positive side, *must* lead to Rome. If 'High Church' principles be really substantive and distinct, what possible danger can there be in heartily and ungrudgingly carrying them forward to their results? and if they be not substantive, who could grieve that this fact should be established by means of a fair trial? For my own part I think it would not be right to conceal, indeed I am anxious openly to express, my own most firm and undoubting conviction, that were we as a Church to pursue such a line of conduct as has been here sketched, in proportion as we did so we should be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of Divine wisdom and authority in the Roman Church, to repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her communion, and to sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration."

His last words, however, are not on Rome or England or any technical questions of theological controversy, but on the great principle which is at the root of all, and which in his opinion united all men of good will—viz., "the supremacy of conscience in the pursuit of moral and religious truth." Of his theory in this matter we have already given a sufficient account. I will here cite only the words with which the book closes. The "most unhappy fact" of the time, "which all serious men should deplore," he maintains, "as the most fearful of God's judgments, is

"That good men and faithful followers of their Saviour dissipate their energies in contention with each other instead of uniting them against the social, moral, and religious evils which flourish in

such rank luxuriance. Here must be sought the full reason for that sort of instinct whereby holy men look at these latter days as especially degraded; and the remedy of this evil is the object to which all who love holiness and peace should direct their combined efforts.

"That a sustained and vigorous attack on the principles of the Reformation is the only course by which this object can be attained is my deep and certain conviction. But by this I mean, not an eloquent or argumentative denunciation of the evils of that movement, but a far more hopeful procedure, and one in which many may heartily join who altogether differ in their view of the Reformation as a *fact*—I mean a humble and religious carrying out of those great principles which the Reformation denied, obedience and faith. Never, within these three centuries, has there been so lively a counter-movement, at least in England, as there is now. This movement has nothing to dread from the opposition of those who fear or dislike it; many of these, doubtless, are holy and humble men of heart, whom we may hope to find one day fighting in our own ranks; but, however that may be, the opposition raised by adversaries of the truth is, in every age of the Church, most wonderfully overruled to the advance of that truth which they oppose. But God has imposed on *upholders* of the truth a fearful responsibility; He has allowed them the mysterious power of thwarting by their sin or perverseness His own gracious work.

"This it is alone which the cause of truth among us has at this moment to fear: if any from the number of those who feel called to act in its defence should allow themselves to be led away by plausibility of argument, or by excitement and imagination, from following the plain and certain dictates of their *conscience*."

---

NOTE.—The following is an account of the Rule of Life in a French Ecclesiastical Seminary, communicated to Mr. Ward by the Rector of the Seminary (see p. 279), and cited in the *Ideal* with the object already explained.

In order to form our candidates for the priesthood to the holiness necessary to the state of life for which they are destined, the Rule prescribes the following methods:—

I. Vocal prayer at half-past five in the morning. It is short, and proceeds as follows:—1. The student puts himself in the presence of God, by a special act of faith in the truth of His universal presence, and adores Him. 2. He thanks God for the gift of the day thus beginning, and consecrates to Him all its actions, promising to do them all in imitation of Him. 3. He recites in the ecclesiastical language the Pater Noster, Ave Maria, and Credo. 4. He commends himself to the Blessed Virgin, to his patron saint, to his guardian angel, that they may watch over and protect him during the day, and by their prayers obtain for him

the graces of which he has need. The whole concludes with acts of faith, hope, and charity, of contrition, and renewal of baptismal promises.

II. Mental prayer or a meditation; in which the student first bows down in adoration before God, acknowledging himself unworthy of keeping himself fixed in His divine presence, and calling upon the Holy Spirit to help him in his meditation. He then enters on the consideration of the subject proposed for meditation, all the while frequently entering into himself, by acts of humiliation, by making good resolutions, and one special good resolve for that very day. These two exercises, the vocal prayer and meditation, last half an hour. In those seminaries directed by the community of St. Sulpice they last an hour.

III. The holy sacrifice of the Mass. It is offered up immediately after the meditation. During the first part each one present, by prayers and special thoughts, offers himself up with our Lord Jesus Christ. At and after the consecration each one adores Christ, really present on the altar; immolates himself with Him; and communicates in His sacrifice, either sacramentally, if he has permission from his confessor, or spiritually.

IV. Holy Scripture. Every one is in the morning to read a chapter of the Old Testament, and in the evening one of the New. The Rule warns us that the object to be sought for is the quickening of the heart (*vie pour le cœur*). It would be a departure from this object if any one were to read the Scriptures at this time in order to improve himself in learning or to satisfy his curiosity.

V. Spiritual Reading. This takes place either in the morning or in the evening. The books recommended are the *Imitation*, the *Spiritual Combat*, the *Christian Perfection of Rodriguez*, the *Memoriale vitæ Sacerdotalis*, etc.

VI. Examination of conscience. A quarter before twelve all go to the chapel for the particular examination. This means an examination as to the progress made in some virtue specially proposed by each for his own acquisition, or in conquering some vice proposed in the same way for correction. The book used in this exercise is Father Tronson's *Examens Particuliers*, a work full of profit for the ecclesiastic. This particular examination does not supersede the general examination made in the evening, and which includes all the thoughts, feelings, words, and actions of the day.

VII. Visit to the Holy Sacrament. Each student is bound to go every day for a quarter of an hour into the presence of the Holy Sacrament. This exercise, the special joy of the devout soul, consists in adoring our Lord present under the Eucharistic elements (*espèces*), in thanking Him for the happiness of being in His holy presence, in begging His pardon for the faults which we have committed, in asking of Him to grant us the graces of which we have need, and in praying that He will deign to manifest to us His holy will, and lead us on to do it.

VIII. Spiritual Conference. This name is applied to a religious discourse spoken every evening by the Superior to the whole community, from half-past six to a quarter to seven. It is a familiar instruction on the duties of a Christian, and of a clergyman in particular.

IX. The Chapel. After the discourse of the Superior each student recites five decades (*dixaines*) of the Pater Noster and Ave Maria. These prayers are sweet to a Christian's mouth, and never seem long, however often they may be repeated. Advice is given that at each decade the person reciting the chaplet should think upon some virtue which he would acquire, and beg of God to grant it to him by the intercession of the Blessed Virgin.

X. Evening Prayer. This finishes the day. The prayers then said are the Lord's Prayer, the Angelical Salutation, the Apostles' Creed. The confession of

sin is made by a prayer called the Confiteor; then acts of faith, hope, and charity, and of contrition, are made. Prayers are offered up for the dead. In conclusion, the Superior gives out the subject for next day's meditation. Sometimes the choice of it is left to the students. The Rule advises them to *fix their thoughts upon it just before going to sleep and as soon as they awake.*

XI. I had almost forgotten to say that the studies, lectures (classes), and meals are begun and concluded with prayer. Also in the morning, at mid-day, and in the evening, the prayer called the Angelus is recited, and this is done to pay honour to the mysteries of the Annunciation and Incarnation.

XII. Confession. Every student is bound to confess *at least once a fortnight.* Few of them wait so long. The object of this confession is, to obtain absolution and leave to communicate.

XIII. Holy Communion. The Rule does not prescribe Communion, but it expresses a wish that all should communicate at least every Sunday. The confessor, in the secrecy of the Holy Tribunal, determines how often the Holy Sacrament should be received. He judges by the state of the penitent's soul. In order to communicate frequently it is requisite that the recipient lead a life of faith (*vie de la foi*), and that by his spiritual progress he make it evident that this heavenly food does him good. For some years past we have had the comfort of seeing our students communicate some two, others three, four, five, or six times a week. We are indebted for this consolation to the good state of the *smaller seminary,* from which our students come to us almost entirely formed.

XIV. The Monitor. Every pupil *is bound to choose one of his fellows for a monitor.* The pupil who agrees to undertake the office is obliged to warn him to whom he is monitor of all that he sees wrong in him. This advice, given in a spirit of charity, is commonly of great benefit.

XV. The Spiritual Director. Every pupil is also obliged to take from among his masters a director, to whom he from time to time applies *to confer with him on his spiritual state* (*ses dispositions intérieures*), on the way to correct, improve, and perfect it. This laying bare of the heart to the director thus chosen contributes in an especial way to the spiritual welfare of the students, provided it is made in a great spirit of faith. Generally each pupil makes choice of his confessor for his director.

XVI. The Relations with the Superior. The Rule advises the student to enter into communication with the Superior, to visit him often in order to receive his advice, and if need be his private rebuke. This wise provision enables the Superior to *gain a knowledge* of the pupils, *to form them,* and *to assure himself of their vocation.* For this reason his door is never shut against them, and he feels himself called upon to give them all his time. The Superior of a seminary must thus cease at once to be a man of study. He must give up the notion of being a learned man, otherwise he will not be able to do the good which the diocese expects of him.

XVII. The Retreat. The year commences and finishes with a retreat. The retreat, which ensues on the meeting of the seminary after the vacation, lasts three days, exclusive of the day which opens and that which closes it. All these days are passed in silence. Each one then examines his conscience, confesses, makes plans for the good employment of his time, and prescribes himself with this object in view a special rule in order to help himself on in the ways of Christian and clerical perfection. In some seminaries the retreat lasts nine days. The retreat at the end of the year is shorter. The object is the good employment of the vacation.

XVIII. The Vacation. It lasts three months. The Rule makes them long, less for the sake of giving rest to the students, than in order *to give them an opportunity of trying their faith in the world.* During this time their Superiors are the priests of their respective parishes, who have them in charge, and from whom they are obliged to bring a certificate to bear witness to their life.

This is what the Rule prescribes; but all the students add to this a certain number of little schemes practised by them in private. These consist in frequent liftings up of the heart to God, little visits to the chapel, spiritual conversations with their superiors in recreation time, conventional means to recall a sense of the presence of God. They place on their table for this purpose small crucifixes, pictures of the Holy Virgin, or of those saints with whose history they are best acquainted. A number of them agree to pray together, or to give each other charitable warnings, and these associations have the happiest results.

# CHAPTER XII

## CONSEQUENCES OF THE "IDEAL"

### 1844

THE *Ideal* was published in June 1844, and from that date till the following December no official notice was taken of it by the University authorities. It was looked on by the more moderate Tractarians with dismay. It came out at a critical time. The party had just made a vigorous, but wholly unsuccessful, move to oppose the appointment of the Evangelical Warden of Wadham—Mr. B. P. Symons—as Vice-Chancellor. The attempt was defeated by the overwhelming majority of 882 to 183. The new Vice-Chancellor was not likely to be the better disposed towards the Puseyites for their action; and the University authorities had not shown hitherto any such careful discrimination between the extreme and moderate members of the party, as to prevent their identifying them one and all with Mr. Ward's strong statements. The possibility seemed imminent—and in the event it was all but realised—of some measure which would imperil their whole existence as a part of the Established Church. Personal attachment to the Church, as the case of John Wesley sixty years earlier had shown, was no final bar to separation from it, when forces were at work which were totally out of harmony with the spirit of existing Anglicanism.

However, for a time the book passed without official notice, though in private society and in the newspapers and reviews it was much canvassed. The *Edinburgh Review* eagerly hailed it as an illustration of the *Developments of Puseyism*, which Mr. Henry Rogers was criticising with such vigour in its

pages. Mr. Gladstone attacked it in the *Quarterly*, and the lesser magazines followed suit. To thinking men of very opposite schools the book appealed with force, though few accepted its conclusions as a whole. The conventional Churchman looked on it simply with horror, as a reckless and unsettling production. John Mill and Comte were especially interested in it. "Have you seen Ward's book?" Mill writes to Mr. Bain. "It is a remarkable book in every way, and not the least so because it quotes and puffs me in every chapter,—and Comte occasionally, though with deep lamentations over our irreligion." Miss Helen Taylor tells me that Mill often spoke with keen interest of Ward's speculative views. "His *Ideal of a Christian Church*," she adds, "was an epoch-making book to me, as I fancy it was to many now living." And again Mill writes to Professor Bain of Mr. Ward's attitude towards him: "I always hailed Puseyism and predicted that thought would sympathise with thought—though I did not expect to find my own case so striking an example."[1] He wrote to Comte with reference to the *Ideal*, and the text of their correspondence shall be given later on. Keble's appreciation of it will appear when we come to speak of the pamphlet which he wrote in Mr. Ward's behalf. Sir William Hamilton expressed in a letter to Mr. Ward deep interest in its general line of argument. Döllinger read it early in the day. "I found him," says Mr. Hope Scott in September 1844, "already deep in Ward's book, with which he is much struck."

Newman's interest in its line of argument, or a great part of it—which was a development of the *British Critic* articles—

[1] *John Stuart Mill: A Criticism.* By A. Bain. Longmans. Pages 69-80. Mr. Bain gives likewise an interesting account of Mill's attitude towards the article on his *Logic* which Ward had contributed to the *British Critic* a year earlier. "The first adverse criticism of importance," he writes, "was an article in the autumn number of the *British Critic*, of nearly a hundred pages, known to have been written by Mr. W. G. Ward, the ally of Newman and Pusey. It was a most remarkable production, and gave Mill very great satisfaction, all things considered. It was not so much a review of the *Logic* as of Mill altogether. Mr. Ward had followed him through his various articles in the *London and Westminster*, and had mastered his modes of thinking on all the great questions; and the present article takes them up along with the *Logic*. . . . The parts chosen for attack are the experience-foundations of the mathematical axioms, the derived view of conscience, and necessity as against free-will."

has already been noticed. He had looked forward to the book. It was, in part, a carrying out of his own suggestion that the articles should be matured and completed. But it did not in the event satisfy him. Perhaps he had looked for greater reserve and moderation of expression than the *British Critic* articles showed, in a work of which the full responsibility was accepted. While Ward was writing it he said to Dalgairns, "The great thing we have to look for now is Ward's *magnum opus*," and Dalgairns was anxious to find how far his hopes were fulfilled. He found Newman reading it at Littlemore soon after its appearance. "Well," he said, "what do you think of it?" Newman shook his head. "It won't do," he said. He further sent a message, which seemed called for from the fact that he had expressed in print his sympathy with Ward's line in the *British Critic*, to the effect that he could not approve of the latest statement, in the last chapter of the *Ideal*, of his theory of the sources of religious knowledge—a statement which, as we have seen, implied that members of the English Church were at liberty to look upon the existing Roman Church as their authorised teacher.

The general feeling among the bulk of the High Church party and Tractarians, with the exception of Mr. Ward's immediate following,—Oakeley, who afterwards identified his cause with Mr. Ward's and claimed to be included in the censure passed on the *Ideal*, and most of the younger school, who accepted the book almost entirely,—is expressed in the following passage from a pamphlet by Mr. Gresley, Prebendary of Lichfield:—

"Most heartily do I wish that Mr. Ward was anywhere else rather than at the University of Oxford at the present time, or that he had never been so ill-advised as to publish his unhappy book, or indeed anything else. With good and upright intentions, Mr. Ward's writings have been singularly infelicitous. The Church was going on very well when Mr. Ward unhappily became connected with the *British Critic;* since which time all has gone wrong. The peculiar mischief in Mr. Ward's writings is that he puts forth the most important and valuable truths which, if discreetly stated, might be of the greatest value to the Church; but coupling them with such extravagant statements, such apparent arrogance and scorn of those who differ from him, such misstatements of other persons' views, and such an obvious leaning, or rather identification of himself with the Church of Rome, that an insuperable prejudice is raised against

the very improvements he advocates. Never was there such a mixture of opposites. It may be questioned whether Mr. Ward's Romanising tendencies might not have been passed over unheeded but for the vehement manner in which he denounces the unholiness, and imbecility, and latitudinarianism, and various evil attributes which, whether rightly or not, he thinks he perceives in the present system of our Church. It is on account of this that the anger of many persons is concentrated upon him. He has himself contrived the conductor which is to bring all the electric fluid on his own head."

On the other hand, it was perhaps difficult for such writers to realise, or even to believe, the fact that Mr. Ward had deliberately intended to "bring all the electric fluid on his own head." He knew that his book would annoy the High Churchmen; he knew that it would annoy Pusey and the Tractarians; he knew, or at least thought it probable, that it would annoy Newman himself and some of the more moderate of the Romanisers, as they were called. "What the Church requires is peace," wrote Mr. Gresley. Mr. Ward thought just the opposite; or rather, as he would have put it, not a false peace with a volcano of eruptive matter smouldering beneath; but a preliminary eruption which might secure a subsequent and permanent peace. Certain questions as to the aim of loyal Churchmen, the direction in which they should work for the reformation of the Church, the lawfulness and desirableness of this aim and of the measures by which it could be achieved, seemed to him burning questions. No unity of action could be attained until they had been decided. His conscience would not allow him to strive for a different aim, neither could he feel justified in pursuing it, and in acting on so novel a theory, without authoritative sanction. His views were generally known, and he might, it was true, claim that the silence of the authorities gave them a tacit sanction. But much of what he had said was anonymously written, and there were many who characterised his theories as disloyal and dishonest. In this state of things there were not the conditions of true peace. Peace could come only in one of two ways. If, in view of the vague and almost opposite character of the formularies of the English Church taken together, and in view likewise of the Catholic element she had ever tolerated and preserved, the Romanising party might be allowed a latitude

on their side equal to that allowed to the Liberal school on the opposite side, then they could work with a clear conscience on the lines laid down in the *Ideal;* and the avowed sanction of the authorities would disarm such opposition as was at present threatening the Church with internecine struggles. Or again, if it were authoritatively ruled that such a mode of procedure was unlawful; that the Romanisers were no living branch of the English Church but a decayed one; then they must be cut off. Secessions to Rome would ensue, the source of present disputes would be closed, and peace would follow. Authority must pronounce in one way or another. If it would not speak unequivocally, it must be challenged so loudly and so plainly as to leave no loophole for denying that if the challenge remained unheeded, silence must mean tacit sanction. Thus the most open and naked statements, the most bold and uncompromising tone, seemed to Mr. Ward the necessary condition, if he and those who felt as he did were to retain their position in the Church of England. The present vague and unsatisfactory undefined state of things was intolerable to him. He wished for a definite and intelligible position, and cared comparatively little which way the decision went.

In October 1844 appeared in the *Quarterly Review* an article by Mr. Gladstone, entitled, "Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*," containing a stringent criticism on the method and the conclusions of the work, and on Mr. Ward himself,—on the ground that it ill became a priest of the Church of England to speak of her, even if he thought of her, in terms so wanting in respect. The main points singled out for criticism were Mr. Ward's attack on the Reformation, and his theory on the supremacy of conscience in religious inquiry; and the line of criticism is in both cases somewhat similar, the faults of the book being traced ultimately to habits of mind and intellectual characteristics in the writer, which Mr. Gladstone unreservedly condemns. "His organon is bad," he writes; "Mr. Ward, strangely bitten, as it seems to us, with the spirit of the age, and owing far more of his mental culture to Mr. John Mill than to the whole range of Christian divines, with the exception of Mr. Newman . . . repudiates [the] world-old philosophy, and in its stead he launches upon the great deep of human controversy as frail a bark as ever carried sail." With respect

to the Reformation, Mr. Ward had, as we have seen, spoken in terms of unmeasured condemnation. He had done so on what may be called philosophical grounds rather than historical. He considered the spirit breathed by the records and writings of the pre-Reformation Church far nobler and purer than that which is in our own day witnessed in this land, and he held that the principles the Reformation avowedly introduced were disastrous. Mr. Gladstone's criticism amounts to this:—that the exact character of the Reformers is a matter only to be decided on historical grounds, and that Mr. Ward's book does not indicate —does not, indeed, profess to indicate—that careful historical criticism has been undertaken. Mr. Ward criticised primarily a religious movement, with its witnessed tendencies, and its intellectual and moral results. The actual historical records which he trusted, and the historical views which his argument presupposed, he accepted on trust, from Newman and Oakeley. He considered the philosophical grounds for his view strong, and accepted an historical view in harmony with it, as usual, on the authority of competent judges. The tendencies and principles existed beyond all dispute; the exact details of their introduction were comparatively unimportant in his view. But this mode of reasoning Mr. Gladstone does not contemplate, and he views the absence of first-hand historical evidence as the absence of all evidence. After quoting Mr. Ward's expressions of condemnation he writes thus:—

"Here is the verdict deliberately pronounced by Mr. Ward against the English Reformation and its authors; and it amounts simply to this, that no words which human language will supply can suffice to describe their vileness. But where are the grounds of this verdict? where are the evidences of patient, laborious, and impartial examination by which alone such a verdict could be justified, and without which it cannot be excused? Mr. Ward will remember the Athenian law by which in certain cases the accuser failing in his proof forfeited his head. A great moral truth was figured by that law,—the immense responsibility of those who bring heavy charges, and in consequence both the great merit of those who impeach justly and the great guilt of those who accuse falsely. . . . Every principle, not only of reverence but of propriety, in a much lower sense, and one tithe of that regard for the sacredness of hereditary religion to which in its other bearings he assigns so enormous an importance, required of him that if he deemed it his duty as a priest of the Church of England to pronounce the heaviest of all

judgments on his antecessors and progenitors in the faith, he should prove that this had been done only in sorrowful deference to conscience at every step, and not without the grave and dispassionate examination which his learned leisure at Oxford and his manifest abilities would have enabled him to institute. But instead of this he appears tranquilly to assume that the English bishops of the sixteenth century are ecclesiastical outlaws against whom any and every man's hand is to be raised; that in order to dispose of their claims upon us no process is necessary, no counsel or jury, no judge, no testimony; the hangman is the only person whose function is applicable to their case, and even he cannot fully discharge the debt due to their demerits."

The article is throughout judicial in its tone, and expresses appreciation of the "evident sincerity and engaging warmth" with which Mr. Ward disclaims all arrogation to himself of any right to stand above the system which he criticises. Further, he notes what some failed to note, the complete absence throughout its strictures of personal criticism or imputing of motives:—

"Not only are we bound to admit that this book is characterised in a very pleasing manner by the absence of personal unkindnesses, but the follies and sins of men are not charged upon them; they are transferred bodily to the Church, as if hers were the one and only power that moved the vast machine of English society. Let, therefore, full scope be given to all that Mr. Ward has truly said of our sins, our negligences, our ignorances; of the slight and perfunctory manner in which we discharge the great work of the government of the conscience; of our deadness to the denunciations of Scripture concerning the perils of wealth, and the difficulties it interposes in the way of salvation; of our insensibility to the Christian equality, or (should it not rather be said) the Christian superiority of the poor; of our narrow and lethargic sense of Christian brotherhood. Let us combine with these repentance and humiliation for that sin which Mr. Ward has scarcely touched, but on which we think a reasonable reformer would have laid the greatest stress—namely, our slowness to take advantage of those means of grace and discipline which the Church actually furnishes; our neglect where she invites, and even, alas! our disobedience where she commands."

However, he closes this head of his indictment with uncompromising censure:—

"Whether the Reformation were a blessing or not, whether the Church of England be incredibly corrupt to the very core or not,

whether the Church of Rome be a pure and ideal Church or not, whether a priest of the Church of England be the proper person to announce these discoveries or not, it is important, even before all these things, that the principle should be maintained, that those who judge without examining in matters of high moral import should be called to account; and that children—the demand seems not immoderate—should not strike a parent until they have heard her."

Proceeding thence to Mr. Ward's general attitude with respect to the Churches of Rome and England, the concentration of his attention on the excellencies of the former and on the defects of the latter, his implication that such a course is the obvious dictate of humility, and that the customary praise of the existing English system was a sign only of undue self-complacency and blind conceit on the part of English Churchmen, he writes thus:—

"Suppose a father perceives that his daughter's affections are rapidly fastening themselves upon one whom, notwithstanding many apparent or even real excellencies, he yet knows to be tainted with such vices as to render him an unfit and dangerous guide through life, it will be his duty to warn her against the attraction, to expose with an increasing force and plainness, in proportion as the seductive power may become more formidable, the faults of the party; and if she retort upon him that in his house she does not find the extended sympathy she needs, that his temper is phlegmatic and his acquirements limited, it is his duty even so far to extol himself in respect of his guardianship over her, as to make her feel her security and comparative blessedness in the house where God has placed her. Nor is he, acting sedulously and conscientiously within these limits, to be reproached either with want of charity or with surfeit of pride. He may feel the dangers to his personal humility of the duty he is undertaking, but he is bound to persevere and to believe that, like all dangers which really belong and attach to duty, they will be neutralised and averted in its discharge."

Mr. Gladstone's last point of attack is Mr. Ward's theory of the "supremacy of conscience in religious inquiry." Against Mr. Ward's view that those who are obedient to their conscience, and only such, will receive the requisite intellectual and spiritual light for discerning the true and the false in religious matters, Mr. Gladstone maintains that such a theory is "subjective," and makes the truth "what each man troweth." He declares that St. Augustine's *crede ut intelligas* presupposed

proof of the credentials of the Church, "a matter fully cognisable by the human understanding, but not necessary to be investigated by each for himself, more than it is requisite for every British subject to have heard the Queen's assent given to the laws in order to be bound as a reasonable being to yield them obedience." But in this criticism he seems to have overlooked the fact that Mr. Ward's express contention is that there is no proof of Christianity parallel to the proof of the Queen's assent as given to laws; but that the proof of Christianity, and even of theism itself, is as a fact rejected as inadequate by men of firstrate ability; and that the only account of this must be that these proofs contain elements which can be detected only by the individual conscience; a faulty attitude of mind and a wrong way of approaching the subject, rather than intellectual stupidity, being in most cases the real reason why they appear to many unsatisfactory.

Mr. Gladstone's article, so far as it dealt with Mr. Ward himself, concluded in the following terms:—

"In parting we must assure [Mr. Ward] that if we have written freely we have written also seriously; with deep pain, and, we trust, without any gratuitous assumption of judicial authority. Readers more dispassionate than either of us will judge between us. If we are accurate in our view of his methods of proceeding, what has occurred may, as we hope, be a warning to him, useful in his future course, however incomplete, however faulty has been the execution of the task. If, on the contrary, his temper has been one of becoming caution and humility, if a sound philosophy has governed his views of men and things, if his investigations have not been lighter, if his sentences have not been heavier than the case demanded of him, the censure we have pronounced will return upon ourselves, and it will involve us in a double guilt to have committed the very faults which we have used so much freedom in reproving."

Mr. Gladstone's article, the authorship of which was an open secret, told with much effect against the book. "I have read the article on Ward in the *Quarterly*," wrote Mr. Wall of Balliol to Mr. Church of Oriel, "and I think it will seriously damage him. Some parts of it are strong. It is calculated to increase the indignation against him." Indeed at this stage scarcely a word was heard in public in Mr. Ward's favour, though later on it became evident that the frankness and

openness with which he had stated and encountered difficulties which many felt, and which so many writers shirked, and the high moral lessons the book contained, had not been without their effect on persons who at the time were silent.

The correspondence of Mill and Comte on the book may here be cited. Its frank acceptance of the intellectual difficulties in the root doctrines of all supernatural religion was rare, and was naturally in harmony with the intellectual temper of both philosophers; while Comte seems to have been especially pleased at Mr. Ward's elimination of Protestantism from the field of serious religious philosophy, and acceptance of the position that the real war was between Catholicism and Positivism. Mill writes as follows, in a letter dated 26th April 1845:—

". . . Nous avons obtenu, vous et moi, les honneurs d'une publicité assez éclatante par l'intermediare d'un des chefs de l'école Anglo-Catholique, M. Ward, qui fit paraitre, il y a une année ou davantage, un assez gros volume dans lequel il peignit en de très noires couleurs l'état actuel de l'église anglicane, et de la societé anglaise, et se déclara nettement contre la réformation de Luther et appella l'église anglicane à rentrer dans le giron du catholicisme romain. Cet ouvrage fit grand scandale içi, et l'université d'Oxford vient de priver l'auteur de ses grades universitaires comme ne faisant plus partie, au moins en droit, de l'église anglicane. Ce n'est que dernièrement que j'ai lu son ouvrage, bien que j'eusse entendu qu'il y était question de moi.

"Je me suis trouvé cité dans chaque chapitre et plus souvent encore, avec d'immenses éloges entremêlés de plaintes sur mon incredulité et sur la tendance athéistique de mes écrits; il disait, de plus, avoir lu la plus grande partie de votre Cours, sur la foi de ce que j'en disais; il va sans dire qu'il vous tança encore plus vertement que moi sur votre irréligion; cependant il cite plusieurs passages, il fait l'éloge de votre capacité et même de vos intentions; il dit vous reconnaissez avoir pris bien des choses chez de Maistre, mais qu'il vous trouve très superieur en profondeur à ce penseur. Suivant lui, il faut en venir à notre irréligion à nous, si on ne revient pas à la philosophie catholique, car il prône la philosophie du catholicisme tout autant que la foi. C'est une chose assez amusante que nous trouvions un appui si decidé dans ce camp-là, et que M. Ward soit accusé par ses adversaires dans le *Quarterly Review* d'avoir tiré plus d'enseignments de mon école que de celle des théologiens anglicans."

Comte's reply bears the date of 15th May 1845. After speaking of a work by Dunoyer, he says:—

"Ce n'est pas sans etonnement ni sans plaisir que j'ai lu vos interessantes indications sur un autre curieux ouvrage ou je m'attendrais encore moins que vous a être honorablement mentioné. Si vous aviez jamais occasion de rencontrer le docteur Ward, je vous serais obligé de lui faire mes sincères remerciments personnels, surtout pour sa speciale comparaison avec de Maistre; quoique je sois bien certain d'avoir rendu au Catholicisme une plus complête justice historique que n'a pu le faire ce celebre penseur.

"M. Ward est certainement le premier philosophe catholique qui ose en convenir ouvertement, et il restera probablement le seul, sans se douter d'ailleurs que la superiorité qu'il veut bien me reconnaitre a cet égard, au lieu d'être essentiellement personelle, tient principalement a l'excellence spontanée du veritable esprit positif. Quoiqu' il en soit je desirerais beaucoup que le fatal dilemme proposé par ce docteur put se realiser suffisamment, et que la grande lutte philosophique s'engagea désormais exclusivement, comme je l'ai demandé de mon coté depuis longtemps, entre le catholicisme et le positivisme, en eliminant d'un commun accord la metaphysique protestante ou déiste, dans ses innombrables nuances, Guizot, Cousin, Dupin, Thiers, etc. etc.

"Au début de ma carrière philosophique, j'ai déjà eté honoré d'un pareil conflit, lorsque je fus, en 1825, jugé a peu près comme M. Ward vient de la faire, par le trop fameux abbé de La Mennais qui etait alors a son veritable état normale, en tant que pure et energique chef de la franche retrogradation catholique; j'aurais bien voulu que le combat put se suivre ainsi; mais j'en ai reconnu depuis l'impossibilité, d'apres le peu de suite et de netteté propre aux esprits actuels. Vous voyez comme a fini cet éminent antagoniste, a coté duquel je me suis trouvé, il y a dix ans, dans une occasion assez caractéristique, obligé de voir, sans avoir moimême nullement changé, une sorte d'allié honteux dans celui qui m'avait d'abord semblé un estimable adversaire. Avec le décousu logique de notre temps il ne sera pas impossible que votre nouveau catholique éprouvât, et plus promptement peut-être, une semblable dégénération que je suis loin de lui souhaiter."

In the course of the October term it was whispered that mischief was brewing, and that the Heads were devising a scheme of repression against the author of the obnoxious book. What the exact measures were to be it was not known. "It was kept a profound secret," writes Dean Stanley, "during three long autumnal months, and the secret was only broken by one of those extraordinary incidents which occur now and

then in fiction, but rarely in actual life. The documents (containing the proposed measures) having been sent to London for a legal opinion, were diverted from their proper destination in the post-office at Oxford, and inserted in a parcel of college leases addressed to one of the most enthusiastic followers of Dr. Newman and Mr. Ward. [This was Mr. Bloxam of Magdalene.] The secret thus disclosed was in honour kept by the astonished recipient; but it was not in human nature but that particles of the information thus unexpectedly acquired should leak out in answer to perpetual inquiries." Mr. Ward was therefore not wholly unprepared, when at the end of November he was summoned before the Vice-Chancellor and Hebdomadal Board, and confronted with a selection of six of the most startling and extreme passages from the *Ideal*, some of which I have already quoted in the analysis of that work, and asked if he wished to disavow the sentiments therein contained. Mr. Ward asked for three days' grace, in order that he might consult his friends and lawyer before committing himself to any statement; and on appearing before the same tribunal for a second time on December 3d, refused, under legal advice, to make any statements whatever until the course of action on which the Heads had resolved should be openly avowed.

Ten days later all doubt was set at rest, and the Vice-Chancellor published a notice containing the details of the intended proceedings. The six incriminating passages from the *Ideal* were given in full, and said to be inconsistent with the Articles, and with the good faith of William George Ward in subscribing them; and it was proposed, in a convocation to be held on February 13th following, to pass a resolution to this effect. In the event of this resolution passing, a second one was to follow depriving him of his degrees; while a third measure consisted of a test "by which it was asserted that the Articles for the future must be accepted, not according to the subtle explanations of the nineteenth century, but according to the rigid definitions of the sixteenth. It laid down that whenever subscribed at the University of Oxford they must be accepted in that sense in which they had been originally uttered, and in which the University imposed them." [1]

[1] Stanley. *Edinburgh Review*, April 1881, p. 320.

On the day succeeding the promulgation of this notice (December 14) Mr. Ward published a letter to the Vice-Chancellor, in which he avowed himself the author of the book, and accepted the full responsibility of the opinions in the incriminating extracts.

Mr. Ward's first letter to the Vice-Chancellor was couched in the following terms:—

BALLIOL COLLEGE, 3*d December* 1844.

"MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR—False impressions seem to have gone abroad as to what passed on Saturday, when I appeared before you on the subject of a work entitled *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered*, etc., which bears my name on its title-page; and as impressions equally false may possibly prevail in respect to the proceedings of this day on the same subject, it seems the simple and right course to address you thus publicly at once.

"I was summoned on Saturday, not as before a tribunal which claimed the power of authoritatively putting questions, but merely that I might have the opportunity, if I so wished, of disavowing certain opinions, previously to the Hebdomadal Board proceeding further against me. The questions I was asked accordingly were these:—(1) Whether I wished to disavow the authorship of the above-mentioned work; (2) whether I wished to disavow the sentiments contained in certain propositions, selected from it, which were then read to me. My answer was, that in a matter so important to myself, I wished to take no step whatever without the advantage of consulting with my friends, and taking, if necessary, legal advice; accordingly I asked to postpone my answer until to-day. You replied that nothing could be more reasonable than such a request, and kindly suggested that even a later day might be preferable; an offer, however, of which I did not wish to avail myself.

"On appearing before you to-day, I stated that, acting under legal advice, I must decline answering any questions whatever, until I should know more definitely the course which it was intended to adopt against me.

"From this statement it will appear, I think, that I have adopted no unworthy subterfuge, but rather proceeded on the acknowledged principles of justice. Whenever I am authoritatively informed of the whole method of proceeding which it is intended to pursue against me, there shall be no want of perfect openness on my side also; but nothing surely could be more unreasonable than to expect that, so long as strict secrecy is preserved on that head, I should volunteer any statement, however unimportant, or make any admission, however apparently insignificant.

"I should not do justice to my own feelings if I did not conclude by expressing my strong sense of the courtesy with which I was

treated on each occasion of appearing before you.—I remain, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, your faithful servant, W. G. WARD."

The following is the text of the notice published by the Vice-Chancellor :—

"WHEREAS it is notoriously reputed and believed throughout the University that a book entitled *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered* has been recently published in Oxford by the Rev. William George Ward, M.A., in which book are contained the following passages, viz.—

"p. 45 (note)—'I know no single movement in the Church, except Arianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard as the English Reformation.'

"p. 473—'For my own part I think it would not be right to conceal, indeed I am anxious openly to express, my own most firm and undoubting conviction—that were we, as a Church, to pursue such a line of conduct as has been here sketched, in proportion as we did so, we should be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of Divine wisdom and authority in the Roman Church, to repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her communion, and to sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration.'

"p. 68—'That the phrase, "teaching of the Prayer Book," conveys a definite and important meaning, I do not deny; considering that it is mainly a selection from the Breviary, it is not surprising that the Prayer Book should, on the whole, breathe an uniform, most edifying, deeply orthodox, spirit; a spirit which corresponds to one particular body of doctrine, and not to its contradictory. Again, that the phrase "teaching of the Articles" conveys a definite meaning, I cannot deny; for (excepting the five first, which belong to the old theology) they also breathe an uniform intelligible spirit. But then these respective spirits are not different merely, but absolutely contradictory. As well could a student in the heathen schools have imbibed at once the Stoic and Epicurean philosophies, as could a humble member of our Church at the present time learn his creed both from Prayer Book and Articles. This I set out at length in two pamphlets with an appendix, which I published three years ago; and it cannot, therefore, be necessary to go again over the same ground; though something must be added, occasionally in notes, and more methodically in a future chapter. The manner in which the dry wording of the Articles can be divorced from their natural spirit, and accepted by an orthodox believer; how their *primâ facie* meaning is evaded, and the artifice of their inventors thrown back in recoil on themselves; this, and the arguments

which prove the honesty of this, have now been for some time before the public.'

"p. 100 (note)—'In my pamphlet three years since, I distinctly charged the Reformers with fully tolerating the absence from the Articles of any real anti-Roman determination, so only they were allowed to preserve an apparent one: a charge which I here beg as distinctly to repeat.'

"p. 479—'Our twelfth Article is as plain as words can make it, on the "evangelical" side (observe in particular the word "necessarily"); of course I think its natural meaning may be explained away, for I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense.'

"p. 565—'We find, oh most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight, we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen.'

"p. 567—'Three years have passed since I said plainly that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman doctrine.'

"And whereas the said William George Ward before the publication of the said book was admitted to the respective degrees of B.A. and M.A. of this University on the faith of the following declaration, which declaration was made and subscribed by him before and in order to his being admitted to each of the said degrees, that is to say:—'I allow the Book of Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year of our Lord one thousand five hundred and sixty-two; and I acknowledge all and every of the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God.'

"And whereas the said passages of the said book appear inconsistent with the said Articles, and with the said declaration, and with the good faith of him, the said William George Ward, in making and subscribing the same.

"In a CONVOCATION to be holden on Thursday the 13th day of February next, at one o'clock, the foregoing passages from the said book will be read, and the following Proposition will be submitted to the House:—

> "'That the passages now read from the book entitled *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered*, are utterly inconsistent with the Articles of Religion of the Church of England, and with the declaration in respect of those Articles made and subscribed by William George Ward previously and in order to his being admitted to the degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively, and with the good faith of him, the said William George Ward, in respect of such declaration and subscription.'

"Before the question '*Placetne*,' etc., is put, the Vice-Chancellor will give Mr. Ward an opportunity of answering to the charge of having published such passages so inconsistent as aforesaid.

"If this Proposition is affirmed, the following Proposition will be submitted to the House:—

"'That the said William George Ward has disentitled himself to the rights and privileges conveyed by the said degrees, and is hereby degraded from the said degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively.'

"Before the question '*Placetne*,' etc., is put, the Vice-Chancellor will give Mr. Ward an opportunity of stating any grounds he may have for showing that he should not be degraded."

Then follows the Latin text of the proposed test, which is given in full in the Appendix.[1]

The following is the text of Mr. Ward's second letter to the Vice-Chancellor:—

"BALLIOL COLLEGE, 14*th December* 1844.

"MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR—I consider it due, both to you and to myself, that I should here place on record my reasons for declining (as under advice I did) to answer the questions which you lately put to me; and if I speak with great plainness on the subject (as my position seems to require), I trust you will not consider me as deficient in sincere personal respect for yourself, or in a desire to show all becoming deference to the office which you fill. I should not have taken the course I did on Tuesday, December 3d, but for the interpretation placed upon one important Statute of the University in the recent case of Dr. Pusey. It was held in that case by the late Vice-Chancellor (with the concurrence, as I presume, of those who assisted him), that in an Academical proceeding against a preacher accused of unsound doctrine, it was not necessary or convenient to follow the ordinary forms of justice; and particularly, that the person accused was not entitled to be heard before his judges in his own defence. Assuming (as I was bound to assume) that those who adopted such a course of proceeding believed themselves to be justified in doing so, I could not look upon it as improbable that a similar course might be adopted in my own case also. I had, however, one security against it, which was this—that no such proceeding could possibly be taken without a preliminary establishment of the fact of authorship, which in Dr. Pusey's case was admitted: and, without my voluntary admission, this obstacle to such a course of proceeding could not be removed, since evidence taken in my absence would be equivalent to no evidence at all.

"The question then arose, in regard to the challenge which, in my work, I had so confidently thrown out to those who might think my positions open to authoritative censure,—whether I were bound by that challenge to relinquish this security for the fairness

[1] See Appendix H.

and regularity of the proceedings which might be taken against me, and to facilitate, by preliminary admissions, any and every mode of action by which it might be thought practicable to procure my condemnation. Or was I not rather bound (by the responsibility, which I had taken upon myself, of vindicating the liberty of those who subscribe to our formularies to hold the positions I had advanced) to reserve all such admissions till another stage? to wait until it should be apparent that I should be allowed the right of self-defence, and that the appeal would be made to law and justice, responsibly administered, and not to a supposed summary, secret, and irresponsible power? I differed, most conscientiously (and my advisers authorised me to differ), from every interpretation of the Statutes which supposed such an authority as this to exist in the University, at all events as against any who had attained the degree of M.A. I believed that it was the duty of every member of the University to protest against and oppose the assumption of it: certainly I could not conceive myself to be bound to invite or assist its interposition in my own case or in that of any other man. The action of such a power might have placed me personally in a situation of distress and difficulty, but it could not have advanced in the least degree the settlement of those questions, which I had challenged my opponents to bring to a judicial issue. Its censures would have been, in my view (as in the view of my advisers), not less extra-judicial than those of any private individual. For these reasons, I thought it proper to withhold a formal admission of the authorship of my work, until I should be acquainted with the use intended to be made of that admission, and the whole course of proceeding which it might be proposed to adopt against me; using this technical advantage as my safeguard against the adoption of a process which was not unprecedented, which I did not believe to be legitimate, and by which I should have been excluded from the right of self-defence.

"I now make the admission, because the intended mode of proceeding has been disclosed; and it appears to be one which will at least give me the opportunity of defending myself before those who are to be my judges. I am not conceding that the proposed appeal to Convocation gives me the opportunity of obtaining that calm, deliberate, and dispassionate consideration of my arguments, to which in strict equity I am entitled; but still I am informed of the charge brought against me, and I have practically the power of pleading my cause before those who are to be my judges. And this course I intend at once to take. I am actively preparing a pamphlet, the object of which will be to enforce the position (which I most confidently believe to be unassailable), that my subscription to our formularies is as perfectly consistent with good faith as the subscription of any member of our Church. And I am most anxious to join issue solely on the merits of the case. If Convocation has

authority, by the constitution of the University, to deprive a Master of Arts of his degrees for entertaining the sentiments expressed in my book, I desire to interpose no obstacle upon any question of form. Whereas, then, I apprehend that it is no less necessary for Convocation, than for any legal tribunal, to have before it some regular proof of the facts upon which a penal measure against any member of the University is proposed to be founded, my purpose in writing this letter is to supply that proof. But, in doing so, of course, I reserve to myself the right of taking, at the proper time, and in the proper place, all objections which may exist to the exercise of such an authority by Convocation.

"I avow myself, then, the author of the work entitled *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered*, and I most fully take on myself the responsibility of the passages selected from that work for the judgment of Convocation, as expressing sentiments which had by no means been taken up hastily and at random, but which had long been entertained by me, and of which my conviction grows more firm and undoubting every day I live.—I remain, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, your faithful servant, W. G. WARD."

The excitement produced by the proposed measures is described by contemporary writers as tremendous. Few indeed sympathised with Mr. Ward's book, and perhaps comparatively few would have objected strongly to a general vote of censure on his extreme opinions. But the proposed proceedings were so precise in their character and so far-reaching in their consequences—extending obviously to the large bulk of the High Church party, and by direct consequence to the whole of the Liberal party—that the matter became no longer personal to Mr. Ward, but vital to the constitution of the Church. The University was ostracising half its most promising sons. The Liberal party could as little accept the dogmatic clauses of the test as the High Church party. Then there was a further difficulty. The present sense of the University —if interpreted by its Heads—was undoubtedly—as far as could be ascertained—Low Church.[1] Was this identical with the sense of the framers, as it professed to be? The test was either tyrannous or self-contradictory. And it raised questions

[1] I use this term—the meaning of which has gone through several different phases—to denote opposition to the doctrines of the then High Church party as a body. The school of Mr. Palmer and Dr. Hook, it will be remembered, *accepted* Tract 90. The old "High and dry" Churchmen made common cause with its opponents, and their views on the points in question were more nearly "Low" than "High."

which might be decided by still higher tribunals, and which might result in a general schism. What if the Ecclesiastical Courts were to take the matter up and impose as obligatory a Low Church interpretation of the Articles in the case of candidates for holy orders? Pressing and critical questions were laid bare, and it was difficult to prophesy what results might not ensue. This suffices to account for an excitement which extended far beyond Academic circles, which was felt almost as much in London as in Oxford, which brought up for the meeting of Convocation which was to decide upon the proposed measures an almost unprecedented crowd, including prominent statesmen, lawyers, philanthropists, as well as dignitaries and clergymen of the Church of England.

"From most of Dr. Newman's adherents," writes Dean Stanley, "a cry of anguish went up against [the proposed measures]; but another opposition of a different spirit arose from a section of the clergy and the community, who were indignant at this attempt by a strict definition of subscription to abridge the liberties of the English Church. This was the Liberal party of the Church of England—a party which from the days of Lord Falkland had never been extinct, . . . but which made themselves heard on this occasion by those who under the influence of Arnold had become firmly possessed of the idea of the latitude intended and required by a National Church. One who has since been raised to the highest post in that Church [Archbishop Tait] . . . generously put aside his former objections to the celebrated Tract, and issued a powerful and convincing protest against the danger of enforcing this new test on the whole Church of England. Mr. Maurice, forgiving all the obloquy with which he had been loaded by the High Church party, came forward at the same time. Professor Donkin, the most serene unimpassioned intellect of Oxford, whose untimely death the Liberal ranks have never ceased to deplore, wrote a short and trenchant pamphlet on the subject. Mr. Hull, the venerable opponent of the Athanasian creed, became the champion of the party now placed in so much danger of being themselves the victims of a popular clamour. . . . Milman, from his retreat in the cloisters of Westminster, loudly protested against the impolicy of the whole proceeding."

While the plea of general toleration was thus vigorously put forward by the Liberals, the Puseyites themselves were at first less active. Newman himself kept entirely aloof from the struggle, though later on an attempt was made, as we shall see, on the part of the authorities to drag him into the

arena. Pusey made no sign. But Keble wrote against Mr. Ward's condemnation, though by no means accepting the substance of the *Ideal*, and wrote in terms which brought a considerable accession of weight to Mr. Ward's cause. Moberly, too, was one of the Churchmen who joined in the protest of the Liberal party, and Oakeley published a pamphlet in his friend's behalf.

Of these publications four call for detailed notice—namely, the letter addressed to the Vice-Chancellor on the subject by Dr. Tait, then head-master of Rugby; the letter to Dr. Jenkyns, master of Balliol, by Dr. Moberly, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury; the pamphlet by Keble—the most weighty of all the protests on Ward's behalf; and two letters by Frederic Denison Maurice to a friend.

The first-named of these approved in part of the proceedings against Mr. Ward personally, but condemned the test and warmly vindicated Ward's "good faith," which was impugned in the statement of the Vice-Chancellor and Hebdomadal Board. The upshot of the letter was that the proposed test laid down a principle which would make matters go hard not only with Ward and the Newmanites, but with many other schools of thought rightly recognised as holding a place in the Established Church. This was, of course, exactly what Ward had maintained. "My subscription," he had said, "is as honest as that of others." He had asked for some principle to be laid down on which his subscription could be proved dishonest, and the proposed principle proved the same thing in the case of others. Tait, however, took this into consideration and maintained that it was a question of degree. A certain latitude of interpretation should be allowed, but Ward's "non-natural sense" exceeded due limits. "The question will immediately arise," he wrote, "if this liberty be claimed by so many already, who are honestly included within the Church of England, why is Mr. Ward to be blamed? The answer is obvious; liberty may degenerate into license, and in his case it has done so. He has raised the standard of rebellion against the Church whose minister he is. I believe there is scarcely any fair man, whatever be the degree of liberty which he wishes to see tolerated in the Church of England, who can think it right to invest a man with authority as one of its recognised teachers

whose open avowals prove that he will use all his influence within its pale in destroying its whole character as a Reformed Church. If any M.A. becoming a Socinian were to proclaim that he had signed the Articles in a non-natural sense, holding them only so far forth as they are consistent with enlightened human reason, the authorities of the University would be right to remind him that he had gone beyond the bounds of all due liberty, and to deprive him of the authority to teach, which he received on the distinct understanding of his renouncing Socinian error. The same holds with Mr. Ward, who has received his commission as an authorised teacher on condition of his renouncing Romish error. But let the University deal with each of such cases as it arises. There is no need of our narrowing the limits of the Church of England, because some amongst us wish to make them too wide."

The letter attempted to lay down no principle at all, and as Mr. Ward's book had simply dealt with the principle of the matter, the two were, so far as argument went, at cross purposes. And as to the practical view of the matter, strange as it may seem, Mr. Ward strongly sympathised with the advocates of his own condemnation, though he considered their course logically indefensible, simply because the Anglican establishment was in itself hopelessly illogical. Those to whom the Protestant character of the English Church was dear, ought, he considered, to regard him as a dangerous man whose influence should be checked. Tait showed his knowledge of this side of Ward's view of the question in the course of the following passage in his letter—

"Holding Mr. Ward to be a Roman Catholic in everything but the name, however much I may esteem him as an individual, I cannot disapprove of the punishment with which it is now proposed to visit him. I would not, of course, be understood to speak as if it were just and proper to pledge oneself to vote for his condemnation, before the accused has made that defence which it is proposed to allow him on the 13th of February; but, according to the *primâ facie* view of the case as it now stands before us, I must consider that the most vital interests of the Church of England require some distinct announcement on the part of the University, to mark that the misinterpretation of the Articles which he advocates is inconsistent with his position as one of its authorised teachers. And unless I much mistake the character of Mr. Ward himself, after

an intimate acquaintance with him for above ten years, I am sure that he will look with very great contempt upon the Protestantism of any who are not ready to urge the necessity of his challenge being accepted, and his teaching condemned. . . .

"Those who know Mr. Ward, and the boldness and straightforwardness of his character, will not doubt that, as he felt uneasy in the idea of holding his present opinions without openly proclaiming them, when he wrote his book it was in the full hope that his challenge would be answered, and the question finally settled by competent authority, whether or not a clergyman of the Established Church, and (as a graduate) an authorised teacher in one of the Universities, is entitled to retain all the authority and influence which his double position gives him, while he glories that he rejects no one doctrine of the Church of Rome. And as the Bishops of our Church seemed unwilling to move in the case, the thanks of the community are due to the Heads of Houses in Oxford for taking upon themselves the odium and trouble of this most painful conflict."

The consequences anticipated from the degradation, if passed, are thus sketched in a note at the end of the letter:—

"If, from any provision in the statutes of Balliol College, Mr. Ward were to lose his Fellowship in consequence of his proposed degradation, he would, of course, have an action at law against the University for depriving him of a pecuniary benefit; and the question would at last be finally settled by a competent judicial authority, whether or not a clergyman of the Church of England is entitled to retain his emoluments as its minister, without renouncing any one Romish doctrine.

"If, on the contrary, Mr. Ward still continues to be Fellow of Balliol, he will, by the act of Convocation, be placed *in statu pupillari*, and therefore become amenable to the discipline exercised over persons in that condition. He may, therefore, at any time, by the authorities of his College, or of the University, be required to discontinue his residence in Oxford for an indefinite length of time; and thus an important college will be saved from the strange anomaly of having one of its ablest and most influential resident Fellows availing himself of his position within its walls, for indoctrinating those who come within his sphere with the principles of Rome.

"It may be said that Mr. Ward does not teach, but only believes in the doctrines of Rome. But any one who knows the manliness and straightforwardness of his character will at once acknowledge that it is physically impossible for him strongly to believe any set of opinions and not give utterance to them."

Dr. Moberly wrote to the Master of Balliol, strongly protesting against each and all of the measures.

"The propositions," he wrote, "are in themselves so great, they involve such large general principles, and such extreme particular penalties, that I apprehend they will call every member of Convocation to Oxford. . . . This interest I share with many. But it is rather as a Balliol man, as one not wholly unconnected with Mr. Ward's early life, and deeply interested in the proposed degradation of a brother Fellow, whom I myself examined and helped to elect to his Fellowship, that I am induced to break silence on this occasion. I am now called upon with the rest of the University to strip him of those honourable characters with which I thus had a part in investing him. . . .

"Feeling then, as I do, the most utter repugnance to the proposed Declaration, and a strong conviction that the proposed degradation is neither a just and legal, nor a wise and necessary measure, I venture to request the attention of yourself (as the immediate University superior and therefore protector of Mr. Ward and all other members of your college, and as a member of the board of Heads of Houses), and through you that of others, to a few considerations on these two points."

After calling attention to the vagueness and unsatisfactory nature of the wording of the proposed declaration, the writer proceeded to enter the following strong protest against the charge of bad faith against Mr. Ward.

"We are next called upon to decree that these same passages . . . are 'inconsistent with the good faith of him, the said W. G. Ward.' It is a heavy and serious thing to pronounce by a judicial decree against a man's personal honesty. I am ready to condemn these passages or the book at large upon clear and intelligible grounds. I know enough of it to know it to be a dangerous book; but the University must pardon me, *I know Mr. Ward too;* and I know him to be a man of the most thorough and upright integrity. I will not and cannot be a party to a sentence which goes out of its way to declare that he is not an honest man.

"I appeal to you, my dear sir, strongly as you oppose the opinions which Mr. Ward has declared on many points, to testify to his character. I would ask you in face of the University whether he is not a man to whose hearty, thorough, self-abandoning honesty, you can bear the fullest and most cordial witness. I ask this because of the hundreds who will flood to Oxford on the 13th of February there are among them few who know this gentleman; many who are strongly prepossessed against him. Let them at least know, upon the testimony of his very adversaries, what sort of man he is on whose character they are called upon to pronounce so heavy a censure.

"Nay, does not every page of this unhappy book declare the writer's uprightness and noble elevation of moral conscientiousness? What class of man in our Church may not read in that book the most awakening lessons of personal holiness and Church duty? . . . Does he not challenge (ringing as it were with the point of his spear his adversaries' shield, like one bent on mortal combat) resistance, reply, refutation, and if need be deprivation and ejection? Condemn him, then, if he deserves it and the interests of the University imperatively demand it; but hesitate to do what no judicial sentence ever does except by implication, what is beside the present purpose, and what I venture to pronounce not less unjust and unfounded than many of his own charges,—hesitate, I say, to decree that he is personally dishonest in his subscription to the Articles."

A yet more important and much more influential pamphlet on Mr. Ward's behalf proceeded from the pen of Keble, the revered author of the *Christian Year*. If Tait's letter derived additional interest from his personal friendship for Ward, Keble's pamphlet was perhaps all the more remarkable from the fact that he was personally unacquainted with him. In many cases the exaggerated expressions in the *Ideal*—which were in part a mannerism of the author—had prevented those who were not personally acquainted with him from doing justice to its line of argument, and from seeing that there was in it a cogent and temperate undercurrent of reasoning, which might be accepted even by those to whom the strength of invective and accentuated or, as they would have said, exaggerated expressions of opinion as to facts and persons was repugnant. This, however, Keble discerned, and he also saw the intense earnestness and love of holiness which actuated the author.

Keble questioned the expediency of the whole proceeding, and adopted to the full Ward's argument of *tu quoque*, as it was called, against those of other parties whose non-natural subscription was tolerated—at least in the case of extreme latitudinarian opinions. "It seems highly scandalous," he wrote, "that any degree of what is called Romanising should be visited more severely than heretical statements affecting the foundations of the Faith, the Trinity, and Incarnation;" he took up the contradictories of Ward's condemned propositions, and showed that very many could not maintain them whose sincerity in subscribing was unquestioned; and further he

questioned, even apart from its advisability or its logical consistency, the legality of the whole proceeding. One sentence deserves to be quoted, as having especial interest in the light of subsequent events. Those who deplore the prevalence of free thought in the Oxford of our own day now will see true insight in the thought which underlies the following reflection made by John Keble forty-five years ago. "There has notoriously," he wrote, "been for some time a school of Oxford divines, maintaining, to speak plainly, Sabellian opinions. Why has no censure upon them been proposed? The only excuse which suggests itself is, their being supposed few and little likely to spread. *I wish the supposition were correct.*"

As to the charge of bad faith, he wrote as follows:—

"No person who knows Mr. Ward believes him at all likely to be guilty of conscious and deliberate dishonesty: the mistake which his friends and acquaintances of all parties seem rather to dread on his part is what may be called excess of frankness: as though he thought it necessary to state his opinions at every possible disadvantage, and to shock as many persons as he can, lest he should seem hereafter to have beguiled them."

The most forcible part of Keble's argument against the lawfulness of the whole proceeding is contained in the following passage:—

"If Mr. Ward's offence as it stands in the charge, supposing it proved and affirmed, is to subject him to this punishment (deprivation of his degrees), either our present statutes must point it out, or we must make a new statute for the purpose, or we must inflict it without authority of any statute. Now, first, it is not pretended that any existing statute imposes this punishment for this offence. In the next place (setting aside the odiousness of an *ex post facto* law of punishment), it is enough to say that the present proceeding does not affect to make a new statute. For the Hebdomadal Board and the House of Convocation are not alone competent to make a new statute. Lastly, it would seem hardly maintainable that Convocation has a discretionary power of punishing to the extent of degradation in cases not provided for by statute. If it has, we live under this strange condition: that whatever the majority may vote to be a crime becomes so, and being so, the same majority may vote it punishable by the loss of a degree. This would be a new kind of law, I believe, for any other corporation. It surely behoves us all, of whatever party, to consider well before we lend our help to introduce it among ourselves. Even if the sentence were legal,

there are circumstances attending this punishment of degradation which would make us all most unwilling to inflict it except in very extreme cases of deliberate moral guilt."

He concludes with the following testimony to the value of the work, which was all the more remarkable as coming from one who, to use Mr. Oakeley's words in referring to it, was "apt, if any, to measure each word he utters; who speaks the more forcibly in proportion as he speaks less often, and whose sayings, so calm, deep, and comprehensive, strike on many ears in these tumultuous days with almost the force of oracular intimations."

"I have not felt at liberty to dwell here on the positive merits of the author of the *Ideal* towards the Church of England, and many perplexed consciences within her, in respect both of large portions of that work and of some former and more elementary publications; although for both (amid serious disagreement from some of his principles, if I understand them rightly) I cannot but feel deeply grateful. Of course to such as sympathise in this feeling, and appreciate also the many noble traits of character which Mr. Ward's writings disclose, it must be simply impossible to find him guilty of 'bad faith,' or to think of his being degraded without a deep sense of wrong and dread of retribution."

One more writer of name and importance, who attempted to shield Mr. Ward from the wrath of the Heads, must be quoted, and his opinion referred to in some detail. Frederick Denison Maurice, in two letters addressed to a friend, the first dated 21st January, the second 9th February, protested in the strongest terms against the proposed condemnation and degradation. "I do most solemnly and passionately implore you," he wrote, "not to be tempted by your indignation at Mr. Ward's language to join those who are entering upon the most mischievous course, it seems to me, which the worst enemy of the Church and University could invent or desire for them."

The proposed test seemed to him full of difficulties for all parties. It was one thing to say that an honest subscription to the Articles could not be compatible with the holding of all Roman doctrines, against which the Reformation was a protest; but to limit their interpretation to the one supposed sense in which their compilers understood them was, considering the

many shades of opinion tolerated at all times in the Established Church, a very different and a very embarrassing proposal. As to the measures against Mr. Ward personally, he considered them unwise, as bringing a dangerous and clever book *en evidence*. The extracts chosen gave no true idea, he thought, of the general tone of the book, as the qualifications and reserves elsewhere to be found were necessarily omitted. Young men would be tempted to reaction from the prejudice they had conceived against it when reading the condemned extracts, on finding how different the book was, when they perused it as a whole, from the conception they had at first formed of it. And consequently Mr. Ward would gain that sympathy from his readers which is naturally given to one who is considered to have been unfairly treated; and the book would have far greater influence than it could ever gain if it were left unnoticed by the authorities.

"In spite of its bulk," he writes, "they will read at least a great portion of a volume which has had the honour of an official condemnation; and when they do read it the mischief to them of having received their first impression of it from these extracts will be evident. They will come to it supposing that it is merely a collection of bold reckless utterances, illustrating the last development, as the Edinburgh reviewers express it, of Puseyism. They will be surprised to find many of the most offensive characteristics of the system which has received that nickname, many of those by which you and I have been most disgusted, nearly all of those which have been most denounced in newspapers and reviews, and which have been regarded as its essential peculiarities, utterly wanting in this its most finished and ultra advocate. Admiration of an antiquarian rule, a tendency to substitute outward formalities for inward religion, indifference to the movements and changes of our time, contempt of Dissenters, whether rightly or wrongly attributed to the authors of the Oxford tracts, cannot, with the least show of reason, be attributed to Mr. Ward. He acknowledges the impossibility of adapting ourselves to the maxims of the Fathers, complains of the English Church for its dry, hard, ritual spirit, and for its ignorance of what is passing in the world; pleads for the sanctity of an hereditary faith, and extends the benefit of the principle to the English sects; declares the authority of conscience to be supreme, asserts the salvation of the soul to be the one object to which all Church discipline, rites, orders, as well as all theological study, should be subservient. His denunciations of the present state of English society are justified by the strongest evidence, and

by the statements of persons of the most unexceptionable Protestantism; nor do I think that any clergyman who is really humbled by what he sees around him, and by the sense of his own responsibilities and sins, will wish to shift on the Government or people the blame which Mr. Ward heaps on him and upon the system to which he belongs. Moreover, the author declares that he is inwardly loyal to the English Church, that he struggles against any tendency to be discontented with the paucity of its means of grace, and that he should consider it a mortal sin to leave its communion. Such words, spoken to all appearance with much sincerity, a generally quiet tone of writing, evident logical ability, with that which makes it more esteemed, a continual attempt to disparage reasoning, as insignificant compared with the testimonies and demands of the moral nature; above all, his disclaimers of all wish suddenly to introduce continental novelties, his desire that each man should merely pursue for the present his appointed course of duty, his confidence that all who do pursue it will eventually be instruments in bringing their Church into entire fellowship with the Churches abroad;—his assurance, however, that the full adoption of the Latin system, 'the whole cycle of Romish doctrine,' will not involve the loss of our Teutonic peculiarities and prejudices, or compel us to receive anything we specially abhor in Spain or Belgium, seeing that it is a system wisely adapted to every variety of race and climate—will unquestionably produce an effect upon young men, which will be much deepened by their previous expectation of something altogether different. And need I remind any person who has watched himself, or other men, that the statements which would have been startling enough greatly to weaken if not to destroy all agreeable impressions if they had occurred to any one in the course of his reading, will come with quite blunted force when he recognises them again as those which had been given him as the characteristical features of it. He will indemnify the author for the injustice which he thinks he did him at first, by not allowing these passages to bear their plain obvious meaning. Or else he will think that that meaning, proceeding from a writer so thoughtful and so cautious, must be an innocent one. He says he has studied the Articles and the intentions of those who composed them, and he is quite certain of his conclusions about them. Can we who have not studied them venture to dispute his authority? And, doubtless, if the Reformers are such scoundrels, there is no harm in our playing a trick upon them in return. Probably, after all, he signs the documents about as honestly as the rest of the world."

As to the language in the *Ideal* with respect to justification by faith, Mr. Maurice went on to say that such young men as he is contemplating will suppose

". . . that a person so civil and courteous could not have committed himself to language of such ferocity if he had not been impressed with a deep conviction that this particular principle, however deeply rooted in the hearts and attachments of Englishmen, must be rooted out at once as being an insuperable obstacle to the Reformation which we need."

With reference to the test, after explaining his own difficulty in pledging himself to subscribe in the sense of the compilers — for instance, in the case of the 7th Article, which in all probability was intended to affirm that the Jews had under the old covenant a clear conception of a future state, a belief which Mr. Maurice confesses himself unable to entertain,—he proceeds thus:—

"I would not make invidious distinctions, but I believe there is one, and only one person in the University, who can with perfect comfort to himself take this test, and that person is Mr. Ward. One who cares nothing for the Articles, who believes them to have been imposed by knavish men for a knavish purpose, who thinks that it is just as likely as not that they may have been intended to make merely truistic statements, cannot, I suppose, have the slightest objection to declare that he subscribes them in the sense (*i.e.* in the no-sense) in which they were originally composed or promulgated."

In his second letter Mr. Maurice speaks thus of the characteristics of the *Ideal*:—

"Mr. Ward's book, though it can hardly be called a development of Puseyism in the sense which the *Edinburgh Review* seems to give that word (as identical with devotion to the Fathers, to antiquity, to Vincentius of Lerins), is unquestionably the last and most complete development of that system worship, the tendency to which has been so painfully apparent in the writings of the modern Oxford school. And as the mind of the author is clearer, harder, more logical, less embarrassed by patriotic sympathies or historical associations, than that of any other person who has taken the same general tone, he has been able to bring out his theory more consistently, to connect it much more successfully with the current feelings and notions of the day, to show upon what maxims it ultimately rests, to point out the obstacles to the establishment of it in our land."

The line Mr. Ward takes "exactly suits those feelings which the Aristotelian cultivation has promoted in Oxford; one of these feelings leads to the belief that the end we should set before ourselves is the formation of a high and beautiful

character, the other to the belief that a system will be the most natural means to that end."

Speaking of Newman's doctrine of development, and accepting one conception of the term—that of the growth of living ideas in living minds—Mr. Maurice writes:—

"There appears to be a strange fluctuation in the writer's mind between this idea and another—the most diametrically opposed to it: one, namely, which would identify development with accumulation. . . . [Mr. Ward] has no dream of a development except in this last sense. The accumulation of notions by Fathers, schoolmen, mystical writers, not the struggling of living thoughts under these notions, is what captivates him. The bigger the heap the greater his admiration. The more it fashions itself into a system to which no light can come from heaven, though it may be always gathering to itself new deposits from the earth, the more he rejoices. He finds it disturbed and decomposed at the Reformation; that event, therefore, fills him with 'burning hatred': he sees it moulding itself into shape again in the hands of the Jesuits, he begins to hope that Providence has not utterly deserted mankind: finally, he sees some of our deluded Saxon race ready to embrace the whole cycle of Romish doctrine, and he prophesies that the Church among us will live again; that we shall have doctors and saints; that our rich men will become humble and charitable, our poor peaceful and devout; that all studies will submit themselves to Christianity, and will be pursued with constant reference to the one end of life."

One further point in connection with Maurice's letter deserves to be noted, both for its own sake and as illustrating the contrast between his cast of mind and Mr. Ward's. I refer to the attempt—the only one, I believe, made in the course of the controversy—directly to meet Mr. Ward's challenge to the University,—that others should explain in what sense their subscription was more honest than his own. Mr. Ward had insisted on the literal wording of individual Articles, and had logically shown that violence must be done to their natural interpretation in many cases, not only by the Romanisers, but by others. Maurice, on the other hand, putting aside the exact logical meaning of individual Articles as a matter of secondary importance, considered that the Articles as a whole did represent, not logically or systematically, but still really, a living principle and a distinct line of opinion; that they represented an energising idea *above* the men who ex-

pressed it, inadequately put forth by them, not in detail recognised by them, making itself known to the world through them, and appreciated by them in the solemn act of compiling the Articles, really though indistinctly;—the whole process being somewhat parallel to inspiration, which conveys mysteriously and inadequately through human instruments divine truths. The living idea—or rather class of ideas—though possessing a certain elasticity, does definitely oppose much of Roman authoritative teaching. It is a revolt against that over-systematising which cramps the spirit.

Mr. Gladstone, whose opinion in the matter carried all the more weight from his authorship of the powerful and temperate article in the *Quarterly* already referred to, refused to be a party to Ward's condemnation, and still more emphatically opposed the proposed test. The following extracts from his correspondence with Archdeacon Wilberforce seem called for as a supplement to the selections given above from his article. In the event Mr. Gladstone voted for Ward, and the Archdeacon against him on both counts.

MR. GLADSTONE TO ARCHDEACON WILBERFORCE.

"HAWARDEN, *December* 29, 1844.

"My mind is only in an early stage of the process of fermentation on the subject of the Hebdomadal Movement at Oxford; and anything I can say is therefore subject to a plenary reserve and reconsideration. But I confess that I can travel but very little way indeed with the Heads; perhaps no further than this, that Ward's propositions are each and all of them deserving of censure. . . . With respect to the new test I have not heard the argument for it, and have some difficulty in conceiving what it can be. In the first place, I apprehend much is to be said on the naked question of legality: but that I pass by. On general grounds I see very many objections. (1) The recurrence to the sense of first promulgation is no guarantee against Wardism, because it is part of Ward's theory that he is acting wholly within the theory of the promulgators. (2) The sense of first promulgation is a matter only to be known by much historical study; and so far as I can get at it I am disposed to believe it was a sense very liberal towards the Church of Rome. This appears to me to stand on the face of the Articles much more than any other sense. But whether that be so or not, I do not think you should call on men to affirm virtually propositions of history, unless they are known either by study or notoriety. And in this case few could have adequately studied, and I am not aware

that any sense (*quoad* these points) is notorious. (3) I find, however, much greater difficulty still in conjecturing what is meant by the present sense of the University. I think there is no University sense sufficiently definite to be made the subject of a test. But even if that position be waived, where is this definite sense to be found? And is it fixed or does it vary from year to year?"

Three weeks later he writes as follows:—

"WHITEHALL, *January* 16, 1845.

"For the sake of the University I am glad to hear that the test is withdrawn. I feel more and more the difficulty of the delivery by Convocation of a sentence in the court of conscience upon Ward. At the same time I grant you that I should be very sorry to think for myself that I subscribed the Articles in a non-natural sense. . . . But I doubt if it amounts to bad faith: and yet more do I feel the false position in which the University and the Church will be placed if in these judicial proceedings it be found that men may tamper with the Articles in relation to the Holy Trinity and the Offices of our Lord and retain their degrees, while a man who sins on the particular points of issue between Rome and the Church of England is to be deprived of his, at the instance of a Board of which that very man is an active member. . . . The vehemence with which I have presumed to censure Ward leads me to feel a special duty of caution and rigid justice in these proceedings."

It may readily be supposed that Dr. Jenkyns of Balliol, who had been so much upset at Ward's defence of Tract 90, did not receive the appearance of the *Ideal* with equanimity. There are traditions current as to its effects on him, which have every sign of being authentic. It is said that he was found pacing up and down his room with the book in his hand—shortly after its appearance—quoting in accents of astonishment and horror some of its strong expressions. "We are a corrupted Church!" "We are in a degraded condition!" "We are to mourn our corruptions in penitential abasement!" "We are to sue for pardon at the feet of Rome humbly;" and then the word "*humbly*" he repeated, in a yet deeper tone of horror.

Mr. Ward was once more summoned into the Master's presence. His tutorship was already gone, and now he was forbidden to act, as he had done for some years, as deputy chaplain for Mr. Oakeley, and to read morning and evening prayers.

This prohibition was made shortly before the feast of SS. Simon and Jude in 1844. On that day, in the ordinary course of things, he was to read the Epistle at the Communion service on one side of the Communion table, while Dr. Jenkyns, as senior ecclesiastic, read the Gospel at the other side. Mr. Ward himself expected some sort of protest from the Master, and he was not disappointed. A scene long remembered by the undergraduates who were present followed. Directly the Master saw Mr. Ward advancing to the Epistle side of the table he shot forth from his place and rushed to the Gospel side, and just as Mr. Ward was beginning, commenced in his loudest tones:—"The epistle is read in the first chapter of St. Jude." Mr. Ward made no further attempt to continue, and the Master, now thoroughly aroused, read *at him* across the communion table. The words of the Epistle were singularly appropriate to the situation, and the Master, with ominous pauses and looks at the irreverent Puseyite, who had sown sedition in the Church and blasphemed the Heads of Houses, read as follows slowly and emphatically: "For there are certain men crept in unawares" (pause, and look at Mr. Ward) "who were before of old ordained unto this condemnation" (pause and look), "ungodly men" (pause and look);—and a little later still more slowly and bitterly he read, "they speak evil of dignities!"[1]

These scenes, which were remembered by the young members of the party as the lighter and more amusing side of the drama of the Movement, are said to have really told painfully on the spirits of the kind-hearted master. He had a genuine and cordial affection for Ward, and, entirely unable as he was to understand the line he adopted, seems to have felt towards him as a father towards a son whom he has cared for and taken a pride in, and who at last robs and forges and goes thoroughly to the bad. A year later, after Mr. Ward had left Balliol and married, an old college servant who was much attached to the Master said to Mrs. Ward in tones of deep feeling, "Oh, ma'am, I'm so glad you've taken Mr. Ward away. You don't know—he was leading the poor Master such a life of it."

[1] I owe the particulars of this scene to the kind information of Mr. F. R. Wegg Prosser, who was present on the occasion.

## CHAPTER XIII

### CONDEMNATION OF MR. WARD

1845

We have now reached the last stage of the proceedings preliminary to the meeting of Convocation of the 13th of February 1845. One part of the proposed measures—the new test—had to be abandoned (as has incidentally appeared in the second extract from Mr. Gladstone's letters) in deference to the general protest against it. Not only the Liberal party, but many of the moderates also protested against it quite as strongly as the Tractarians and followers of Mr. Ward. It was a two-edged sword, and would certainly affect the subscription of such men as Dr. Hampden and Dr. Whately quite as much as that of the Puseyites. But, further, as we have seen, its intrinsic difficulties were great. The "sense of the University" at the present time was a vague and uncertain quantity, nor was it clearly identical with the sense of the first compilers. Then again was there *a* sense of the first compilers? Did they not rather, as being men who attached various shades of meaning to the Articles, represent several senses? Such views were held and put forth, and they were not answered satisfactorily. Mr. Ward published his address to Convocation, in which he enlarged on the difficulties attending the test, and drew out more fully his challenge to all parties in the English Church to show that they were able to subscribe all the Anglican formularies in a natural sense. The test was immediately afterwards withdrawn, and for the moment the proceedings of the 13th seemed destined to be a purely personal attack on Mr. Ward and his book. And even with regard to the book itself, public opinion seems to have taken a turn in Mr. Ward's favour.

"I am clear for Arthur coming up and voting against [the measure]," writes Mr. James Mozley, on the 1st of February; "after Keble and Moberly and the rest have written against it, it should be opposed by all Churchmen." And Mr. Ward himself writes to a friend towards the end of January: "I have been dining at Oriel this evening with Church the Proctor, who was extremely kind as he always is. He seems to think that the tide is rather turning in my favour in public affairs." Indeed there were great hopes that the degradation, at all events, would not be carried—hopes eventually frustrated by the very unconciliatory character of Mr. Ward's speech before his accusers.

Before proceeding further, however, I must give some account of the Address to Convocation already referred to, which Mr. Ward published on 14th January. Its aim and object, and the state of Mr. Ward's mind in connection with its composition and publication, shall be given in his own words. He writes as follows in the Preface to the Address:—

"I am anxious that members of Convocation should fully understand what they are to expect. I am not professing in this pamphlet at all to defend my work, either in substance or in tone. Whether I was justified in using language of such keen and unmeasured invective against the system introduced among us by the Reformation, whether my theory on conscience is true or questionable, on what grounds I consider it safe (or rather my bounden duty) to remain at present a member of our Church;—these, and such as these, are of the utmost importance in themselves, but are wholly irrelevant to the issue which Convocation is called on to determine. What I have wished to do here, is to impress on the minds of members of Convocation what that issue is, and to address a formal argument in my own behalf *on* that issue.

"Nor, again, does this argument profess to be complete, for this, if for no other reason, that a most important branch of it, the historical, has been taken in hand by a writer far more competent to do it justice. That three years should have been allowed to elapse since Mr. Oakeley published his defence of Tract 90,[1] and advocated on historical grounds the position that the Articles were intended to include Roman Catholics; that during this time no sort of answer, or attempt at an answer, has been published; and then, that members of Convocation should think of ruling the

[1] *The subject of Tract 90 historically examined, etc.*

matter by the mere force of numbers, by voting without so much as having professed to give this argument their most careful consideration; this seems to me among those instances (not altogether rare at present) of monstrous and glaring injustice, which future ages will be slow to credit. . . . Since I wrote the body of this pamphlet, a 'Letter to the Vice-Chancellor' by Dr. Tait has appeared. I am really most gratified and most thankful to him for his very kind and flattering mention of myself: and in a different sense, I am also very thankful for the whole 'Letter.' It is written with an openness and honesty which must show how very sincerely it expresses his sentiments; the note in page 16 must show what his theological opinions are; and the observations from p. 12 to p. 15 must show by how lax an interpretation he himself is able to subscribe our formularies. Dr. Tait is a select preacher: shall he, I ask members of Convocation, shall he, with his opinions, be authorised to teach the youth of Oxford with an especial authority, and shall I, with mine, be deprived of my degrees? I leave to them the answer. He will not, I am sure, so far misunderstand these remarks as to doubt that I most cordially reciprocate his expressions of goodwill to myself, and very highly admire the many excellent and most estimable qualities of his character.

"I will not dissemble my apprehension that the tone of the following pamphlet may possibly give offence and pain to many whom I deeply revere [*e.g.* Pusey, Isaac Williams, Keble, etc.] I have found that the same was the case in regard to the tone of my original work, and indeed I expected beforehand that it would be so. As to the work, an opportunity will possibly present itself of entering fully into its defence in this particular. Of the present pamphlet I have only to say that when I consider the extreme laxity of interpretation which *all* parties amongst us must admit into our formularies when they subscribe them, it appears to me perfectly outrageous that they should object to my subscription; and I could not conscientiously adopt a tone which could be taken to imply less than this. But I do earnestly hope and believe that no unbecoming arrogance is really implied in the boldness and decision of my language, either here or elsewhere. If I know anything at all of myself I should say that, whether or not I be considered to rate too highly my intellectual powers (an imputation on which I am not the least sensitive), at all events as to my moral qualities I am in some considerable measure impressed with a knowledge of my deplorable deficiency, and with a deep conviction that if I am able to render any service to theology, it must be by accepting religious truths and moral principles without question at the hands of holy men, and confining myself altogether to the humble and merely intellectual task of analysing those

truths and applying those principles. For want of a better opportunity I may here mention that the article which has appeared on my work in the *Quarterly Review* seems to me so definite and argumentative in character as to require at my hands a reply, which I hope to give it as soon as my present excitement and subsequent weariness shall have come to an end. I am at once so confident of the truth of the general views contained in my work, and so sensible of the inadequate manner in which I have been able to exhibit and illustrate them, that I hail with peculiar pleasure an attack which will give me the opportunity—(1) of understanding more distinctly the prevalent misconceptions (to me very strange) as to my meaning; (2) of explaining it more distinctly; and (3) of proving my positions more irresistibly. Certainly, as far as I see yet, I am quite unable in consequence of that article either to modify or regret a single sentence I have written."

The appeal to other parties to prove that their subscription is more "natural" than his own is then worked out in detail in three sections—one addressed to Evangelical members of Convocation; a second to Low Church members; a third to those High Church members who oppose distinctively Roman doctrine. I may cite as a specimen passage part of the charge against the Low Church party—under which designation he includes the opponents of the High Church doctrine on latitudinarian principles. Here, apart from direct proof, he gives two instances where the Articles have been openly disapproved, and this, in one case, without reservation of any kind.

"There is a writer in high place in the University of Oxford [Dr. Hampden] who has published, and never retracted, his opinion that the 'Articles are fatally adverse to all theological improvement,' and that 'adherence to them is no less incongruous and injurious to religion than in a society of physicians to make the *maxims of Hippocrates and Galen* the unalterable basis of their profession.' That a person holding these sentiments should vote in favour of a new test, which requires them to subscribe to the Articles in *the sense in which they were first put forth*, is a supposition which we ought not, I suppose, to consider conceivable, unless the event were to show it. But I will pass to a less extreme case. Mr. Hull has subscribed the eighth Article, which says that the Athanasian Creed 'ought thoroughly to be received and believed.' He has published a work on this Creed, from which I will quote here only one sentence. 'The Christian faith cannot be set forth at all in the Athanasian Creed or any other form of words; and

*the Church cannot be justified in saying as she now says that so to think of the Trinity is necessary to salvation.*' What course Mr. Hull intends to take on the present occasion I have no means of knowing, but I am quite sure, whatever it is, that it will be adopted according to his conscientious convictions of right. But looking at the matter externally, it is obvious to remark that he and those who agree with him, if they support a vote reflecting on my good faith, impeach far more seriously their own."

He concludes this part of his appeal by putting down a number of passages from the recognised formularies—from the ordination service and from the Prayer-book—passages expressing clearly the Catholic doctrines of a visible Church, of the sacramental system, of a priesthood with supernatural powers, of absolution, of the intercession of angels—which could only be subscribed in a non-natural sense, he maintains, by any one holding Low Church views.[1]

The High Church party are confronted especially with the 21st Article:—

"General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes: and when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have

[1] "Brethren, in the Primitive Church there was a godly discipline that at the beginning of Lent such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin were put to open penance and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord, and that others, admonished by their example, might be the more afraid to offend. Instead whereof (until the said discipline may be restored again, *which is much to be wished*) our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgives them their offences; and *by His authority, committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins.* In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"O Everlasting God, who hast ordained and instituted the services of angels and men in a wonderful order, mercifully grant that as thy holy angels alway do service in heaven, so by thy appointment they may *succour and defend us on earth*, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest in the *Church of God*, now committed unto thee *by the Imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained.* Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God—and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, *which is given thee by this imposition of our hands.*"

neither strength nor authority, unless it be declared (*ostendi*, proved) that they be taken out of the Holy Scripture."

A High Churchman, he maintained, in subscribing this must do so simply in a non-natural sense; and the ingenious method whereby in Tract 90 Newman reconciled the letter of its words with High Church views [1] was more, and not less, roundabout and opposed to the natural force of the terms than such methods as are employed in the *Ideal* for reconciling the 19th Article (*e.g.*) with a "refusal to attribute error to the formal decisions of the papal see."

Such was the main drift of the address; and in its concluding paragraph, addressed to all members of Convocation, he thus speaks:—

"If you have been at all convinced by the preceding arguments, such a reflection as the following will not unnaturally arise in your minds: If our formularies be really capable of so wide a latitude, and if, nevertheless, in order for any one to sign them, parts of them must inevitably be so distorted from their natural sense, is not the existence of such formularies an extreme evil? I believe I speak honestly when I say that if this question be by my instrumentality really and practically brought home to the mind of a sufficient number of my brethren, this fact would alone amply repay all the anxiety and labour in which my work may have involved me."

The doctrines contained in the Articles are thus described:—

"Doctrines for whose truth there is absolutely no warrant except that certain bishops and others three centuries since, for whom no one claims any covenanted Divine illumination, and who were called upon very suddenly to make most extensive changes, considered at the moment that these doctrines were derivable from Scripture and antiquity. What would be said if some one of our colonial bishops were to draw up a set of Articles according to his own notions of Scripture and antiquity, ordain no one except on condition of his subscribing them, and proclaim that all are out of the pale of covenanted salvation who refuse to submit themselves to the teaching of such clergymen? And wherein does this differ from what took place at the Reformation?"

In conclusion, he urges on those who are to try him the solemn duty which is incumbent on them to decide, not from motives

[1] See Appendix E.

of dislike or disapproval of his book,—a question beside the mark,—but solely on the merits of the proposition to be affirmed.

"Accept the following," he says, "as the sum of what I have been saying. If, after the most laborious endeavours to separate off the *opinions* of my work from the *wholly distinct* question you have to consider, and after an anxious, calm, judicial study of our formularies in their whole extent, you come to the opinion that my mode of subscription to them is so different from your mode in its degree of laxity that it amounts to a difference in *kind*, then (so far as my present argument is concerned) come up and vote against me; if you arrive at the opposite conclusion come up and vote for me; but if you are unwilling, or if you doubt your ability to enter on this complex and difficult investigation, then I pray you, for your own sake, not mine (for it will injure you and not me if you commit an unprincipled action), let not zeal for your particular views of religion blind you to those maxims of common justice and morality which must be at the bottom of all true religion, but pursue the honest and straightforward course of refusing to vote on a question which by your own acknowledgment you have not the power, or else have not taken the pains, rightly to understand."

Immediately after the appearance of this address the test was withdrawn, and thus all attempt at meeting Mr. Ward's challenge as to the *principle* of his condemnation was abandoned. The test had asserted a principle of subscription, and that principle Ward, it was said, had violated. Now the principle was no longer put forward, and the proposal became practically an appeal to general indignation against an unpopular book. Some of the fairest minds saw this and protested. Mr. Garbett, Prebendary of Chichester, in a letter to his Bishop, writes:—"Certainly I for one shall refuse to make a victim of Mr. Ward on a principle which Convocation rejects." Ward's challenge had been, "Show me how any of the recognised parties in the Church can subscribe in a natural sense before you condemn me for subscribing in a non-natural," and the response had been, "Let others subscribe as they will, we intend to punish you." The withdrawal of the test seemed in some sense a *ruse* to escape the logical difficulty Mr. Ward had raised, and to secure his punishment by an appeal to passion rather than reason. Many who would have been deterred from condemning the book if the principle of its condemnation had been forced on their attention by the test, were

ready enough to join in the hue and cry against words so insulting to the dignity of the English Church, when the knotty and difficult question on which the justice of the measures really turned was dropped into the background.

The next event of importance was the presentation to the Vice-Chancellor of a requisition signed by 474 members of Convocation, requesting that Tract 90 should be censured by Convocation, as well as Mr. Ward's book. The requisition was couched in the following terms:—

"To the Reverend the Vice-Chancellor and the Members of the Hebdomadal Board.

"We, the undersigned Members of Convocation, respectfully but earnestly request that you will take immediate measures for submitting to the Convocation, about to assemble on the 13th of February next, a resolution conveying the formal censure of the University upon the principles inculcated in the 90th number of the *Tracts for the Times*, and a solemn repudiation of the modes of interpreting the Thirty-nine Articles therein suggested.

"We consider such a censure on the part of the University imperatively called for, and peculiarly appropriate to the important occasion already referred to; inasmuch as we cannot but recognise in Mr. Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church* a legitimate development of the principles of Tract 90, and a practical exhibition of the pernicious effects which must necessarily result from their adoption."

The Vice-Chancellor and Hebdomadal Board accepted and acted upon this suggestion, and on the 4th of February a notice was published of the proposed censure on the modes of interpretation advocated in the Tract. This was a fresh blow at the party, and a far heavier one, should it succeed, than the personal censure on Mr. Ward. But it had, possibly, some effect in leading all the followers of Mr. Newman and Dr. Pusey to put aside their objections to the tone of the *Ideal*, and to combine in opposing the entire proceedings. The "Non-Placets"—those who proposed voting against the measures—issued a declaration disclaiming sympathy with the book, and restricting the import of their vote to condemnation of the particular measures proposed.

In the meantime, in view of the possible and not improbable contingency that the degradation might pass, Mr. Ward's friends had been actively engaged in procuring counsel's opinion

as to its illegality. This was obtained mainly through the active exertions of Stanley and Jowett, who, partly from personal friendship for Mr. Ward, and partly as representing the protest of the liberal party against the curtailing of liberty in the interpretation of the Articles, took from the first a prominent part on the side of the accused.

Sir J. Dodson, Queen's Advocate, and Mr. R. Bethell, afterwards Lord Westbury, published a pamphlet in which they set forth their opinion of the illegality of the proposed measures, and gave their reasons at length. The University authorities obtained, however, an opinion in the opposite sense from Mr. Thesiger—then Solicitor-General—Sir Charles Wetherell, Dr. Adams, and Mr. Cowling, and the programme for the 13th of February was left unmodified.

Early in February Mr. Ward began preparing his speech in defence of his position for the great occasion.

"I am beginning," he writes to a friend with whom he had spent some days during the Christmas holidays, "to work as hard as health allows at my speech for Thursday: I went over to Littlemore to put the skeleton of it before J. H. N., who approved highly. He was in the highest spirits, and talked very agreeably. . . . He is supremely indifferent as to the fate of this new move about himself, which we are all in the highest degree indignant about. . . . Will you give my kind regards to A., and thank her for her letter, which I will not answer, as that would be a needless formality; and will you give B. and C. my kindest regards. . . . And will you give the cook my kindest regards, and deprecate her putting poison into the soup while I am with you."

It is worth while at this stage to pause and note, as one of the remarkable coincidences of the history of the Movement, the close parallel in its details between the onslaught of nine years earlier against Dr. Hampden and the Liberals, and that of the present occasion against Mr. Ward and Mr. Newman. Dean Stanley summed up the facts of the case at the time, and published them in a fly-leaf, which he headed with the word "Nemesis."

"1. In 1836 Dr. Hampden was censured by Convocation on an undefined charge of want of confidence. In 1845 Mr. Newman and Mr. Ward are to be censured by the same body.

"2. In 1836 the country was panic-stricken with a fear of

Liberalism. In 1845 the country is panic-stricken with a fear of Popery.

"3. Four hundred and seventy-four was the majority that condemned Dr. Hampden. Four hundred and seventy-four is the number of requisitionists that induced the censure on Mr. Newman.

"4. The censure on Dr. Hampden was brought forward at ten days' notice. The censure on Mr. Newman was brought forward at ten days' notice.

"5. Two Proctors of decided character, and of supposed leaning to the side of Dr. Hampden, filled the Proctors' office in 1836. Two Proctors of decided character, and of supposed leaning to the side of Mr. Newman, fill the Proctors' office in 1845.

"6. The *Standard* newspaper headed the attack on Dr. Hampden. The *Standard* newspaper heads the attack on Mr. Ward and Mr. Newman.

"7. The *Globe* and *Morning Chronicle* defended Dr. Hampden. The *Globe* and *Morning Chronicle* defend Mr. Ward.

"8. The Thirty-nine Articles were elaborately contrasted with the writings of Dr. Hampden, as the ground of his condemnation. The Thirty-nine Articles are made the ground of the condemnation of Mr. Ward and Mr. Newman.

"9. The Bampton Lectures were preached four years before they were censured. The 90th *Tract for the Times* was written four years before it is now proposed to be censured.

"10. Two eminent lawyers pronounced the censure on Dr. Hampden illegal. Two eminent lawyers have pronounced the degradation of Mr. Ward illegal.

"11. The *Edinburgh Review* denounced the mockery of a judgment by Convocation then. The *English Churchman* denounces it now.

"12. And if, on the one hand, the degradation of Mr. Ward is more severe than the exemptions of Dr. Hampden; on the other hand, the extracts from Mr. Ward give a truer notion of the *Ideal* than the extracts from Dr. Hampden of the Bampton Lectures.

---

"'The wheel then is come full circle.'—The victors of 1836 are the victims of 1845. The victors of 1845 are the victims of 1836. The assailants are assailed, the assailed are the assailants. The condemners are condemned, the condemned are the condemners. 'The wheel is come full circle.'—Voters of the 13th, take this in its true spirit—not as an idle note of triumph, not as a merely striking coincidence, but as a solemn warning to all who were concerned then, to all who are concerned now;—as a sign that there are principles of justice equally applicable to opposite cases, and that sooner or later their violation recoils on the heads of those who violate them.

"'The wheel is come full circle.'—How soon may it come round again? Voters of the 13th, deal now to your opponents that justice which perhaps you may not expect to receive from them; remembering that the surest hope of obtaining mercy and justice then is by showing mercy and justice now. Judge therefore by 1836 what should be your conduct in 1845, and by your conduct in 1845 what should be your opponents' conduct in 1856, when Puseyism may be as triumphant as it is now depressed—when none can with any face cry for toleration then who have refused toleration now, or protest against a mob tribunal then if they have used it now, or deprecate the madness of popular clamour then if they have kindled or yielded to it now."

The eventful day which was to decide Mr. Ward's fate, and possibly the fate of the whole party to which he belonged, was now approaching. Dean Stanley, whose efforts on Mr. Ward's behalf at the time were unceasing, has written a graphic description of the state of feeling in Oxford and throughout the Church.[1]

"The excitement," he writes, "now centred in Mr. Ward. The Old High Church party with its prejudices, the Evangelical party with its natural hostility to anything which bore a semblance to Roman doctrine, were all united against the enemy. It was rumoured that Bishop Philpotts wrote to the Hebdomadal Board expressing his intention of voting against Mr. Ward, but that he needed proof of his being the author of the book. At last came the memorable day, which must be regarded as the closing scene of the conflict of the first Oxford Movement. It was February 13th, St. Valentine's Eve. It was a day in itself sufficiently marked by the violent passions seething within Oxford itself, and aggravated to the highest pitch by the clergy and laity of all shades and classes who crowded the colleges and inns of Oxford, for the great battle of Armageddon, which was to take place in the Convocation of Oxford that day assembled in the Sheldonian theatre. The agitation penetrated to the very servants and scouts. They stood ranged round the doors of their colleges, waiting for the issue of the writ, filled with the *gaudia certaminis*. 'Theirs not to reason why.' The excitement of the day was yet more fiercely accentuated by one of the most tremendous snowstorms which had down to that time taken place within the memory of man. Fast and thick fell the flakes amidst the whirlwinds which snatched them up and hurried them to and fro. Two academics who on the night before had arrived at Swindon, in the hope of finding shelter on that perilous night, found every bed and every corner occupied; yet

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, April 1881, Article I.

such was their ardour for the fray that they walked that dismal journey to be in time for the fatal hour. The undergraduates, who ardently participated in the excitement of their seniors, watched the procession, as it passed under their windows, with mingled howls and cheers; and one of them, of more impetuosity than the rest, climbed to the top of the Radcliffe Library, and from that secure position pelted the Vice-Chancellor with a shower of snowballs to testify his detestation of the obnoxious measure."

The Sheldonian theatre, the scene of the day's proceedings, was filled with Masters of Arts from all parts of England. It was no merely personal event, it was a crisis in the history of the constitution of the English Church, which was in some measure to decide the legal rights and theological position of thousands of her sons. "A great proportion of those who arrived," writes an eye-witness in the *Times* of 14th February, "were men distinguished in public life, who came up purposely to be present at the Convocation." Prominent amongst them were Mr. Gladstone, Lord Shaftesbury, the Earl of Romney, Archdeacon Manning, Mr. J. R. Hope (afterwards Mr. Hope-Scott), Lord Sandon, Lord Faversham, Dr. Tait, Dean Merreweather of Hereford, Sir Thomas Acland, Dr. Moberly (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury), Sir W. Heathcote, the Bishop of Llandaff, the Bishop of Chichester, Lord Kenyon, the Earl of Eldon, Sir John Mordaunt. The Oxford authorities also were present in large numbers. Dr. Pusey supported Mr. Ward by his presence, in spite of his disapproval of the tone of the *Ideal*. Dr. Hampden was present, to witness the discomfiture of the party which nine years earlier had used its power with so much effect against himself. Dr. Faussett, the protagonist of the anti-Tractarians, was in his place. There was a large number of opponents of the measures on public grounds, and a little knot of warm personal friends—Stanley and Jowett, the Fellows of Balliol, Macmullen, Bloxam, Observer Johnson, among their number. Oakeley stood with Ward in the Rostrum, identifying his own opinions with those of his friend, and prepared to abide by their consequences.

"A full Convocation at Oxford," says a contemporary writer,[1] "is an imposing spectacle. The theatre, one of Wren's noblest works, with its rostra and semi-circular galleries, is

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, April 1845.

admirably adapted to enable a large assembly to see and be seen, and to hear a person speaking from one of the rostra . . . though it would be unsuited to a debate in which men spoke from their places. It is fit for its purposes—solemn proceedings and set speeches. On the 13th of February it must have contained fifteen hundred persons, for nearly twelve hundred voted, and the neuters must have exceeded three hundred."

"When the whole assembly," continues Dean Stanley, "was crowded within the theatre, packed as closely as the area of that splendid building would permit, the Registrar of the University read out the incriminating passages of the *Ideal of a Christian Church*. Grown wiser, and we may add, more just, by the experience of the attack on Dr. Hampden, they did not condemn the whole book, but certain extracts which were chosen from it. The general proceedings were in Latin, but it was curious to hear the grave voice of the Registrar proclaiming in the vernacular from his high position these several sentences—'Oh most joyful! most wonderful! most unexpected sight! we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen!' Once again the English language was permitted to be heard in that assembly; the Vice-Chancellor rose in his place and announced in Latin that, by permission of the Chancellor, to Mr. Ward, and to Mr. Ward alone, was to be given the privilege of using in his own defence his native tongue. Then followed the apology for the book, at that time known in its every part, now probably become one of the obsolete curiosities of literature. It consisted of an effective address, challenging all parties in the Church equally to vindicate their subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and calling upon him who was without fault to throw the first stone."

The opening of Mr. Ward's speech has been fully reported. It began in the following terms:—

"MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR—I am bound at once to state that I shall conclude what I have to say by delivering in to you a formal protest against the legality of this whole proposal. I deny that this venerable House has any power, with the present object in view, to decide on the question whether or not my opinions be consistent with the Thirty-nine Articles. Much more I deny that it has any power to deprive me of my degrees. Still I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that should these proposals be unhappily adopted, they may produce considerable effect,—I do not say on my own personal credit, but what is incomparably more important, on the general

well-being of our Church,—nay, you must excuse me if I add, on the credit and good name of this University." [Here some very marked demonstrations of applause were made in the theatre. . . . Mr. Ward immediately addressed himself to those who had made the interruption thus:—"I am sure all who are here must feel that we are engaged in a very grave judicial inquiry, and that those who are here thus as judges will weigh with judicial gravity what is said on the occasion; and that therefore there will not be any demonstrations of feeling or of opinion, however much it might be personally grateful to me to feel that any such demonstration was in my favour." Mr. Ward then continued his speech.]

"Feeling as I do very strongly, and believing in my conscience that this measure as a whole, however otherwise intended by many of its supporters, is oppressive and unjust, I cannot pass over any legitimate opportunity given me to influence the decision to which this House may come; and I shall therefore proceed to press on your attention the chief topics which occur to me as reasons likely to avail with you for its rejection.

"In speaking, then, of myself as of an accused person, and of members of Convocation here present as my judges, you will not understand me to concede that any charge is so much as alleged against me of which I believe Convocation to have cognisance, but only to concede for argument's sake what this is not the place to dispute, in order that there may be free scope for what I have to say. If ever there was an occasion on which an accused person was warranted in using the most urgent and clamorous solicitations for a full, calm, and unprejudiced hearing, such an occasion is the present. I stand here, the supporter of doctrines which the great majority of you who claim to try me hold in suspicion and dislike; the question which you have to determine is absolutely and entirely distinct from the merits of these doctrines; and yet, unless you make the greatest possible effort to free your minds from undue prepossession, it is quite certain that the dislike and suspicion in which you hold the doctrines themselves will bias you, even without your own knowledge, in judging of the wholly different issue which you have to determine. I repeat,—for I cannot repeat it too often,—the issue before you has no more to do with the question whether the doctrine in my book be true or false than with the question whether my style of writing be good or bad, or whether my exposition be dull or interesting. You have heard the proposition submitted to you. It is a declaratory proposition, intended to serve as the foundation for an enactment. The declaration is that I have violated the engagement on which my degrees were conferred, and the enactment that I be deprived of those degrees. You see at once that no theological determination is so much as hinted at. My opinions are complained of not as being false, or dangerous, or

undutiful, or rash, but as being inconsistent with my good faith. One issue in regard to them, and one only, is placed before you,—their consistency with certain formularies which I subscribed when I received my degrees, and my good faith in respect of those subscriptions.

"If the Oxford Convocation had any claim to represent the Church of England, undoubtedly their disapprobation of my theology would have the utmost weight in determining (even then I don't see how it could determine what *has* been the meaning of subscription, but) what it is hereafter to be. But you who are to be my judges have no royal road open to discovering what is the true sense of the Church of England. You must proceed by the same humble path along which a private individual like myself proceeds; you must judge of her sense by examining her formularies. All the wishes in the world cannot alter facts. Your belief that certain doctrines are ever so pernicious can have nothing to do with the question whether they are allowed by the symbolical documents of the English Church; and yet I cannot but fear that vast numbers of you mix up in your minds these absolutely distinct matters, and spare yourselves the trouble of examining this question that is before you, because of your intense conviction on a question you have nothing to do with. And this difficulty of procuring a fair hearing is greatly increased by the necessary nature of my defence. I subscribed certain formularies in what I have called a non-natural sense. Granted. But is it the intention of the Church of England that they necessarily be subscribed in a natural sense? If it be, *then it is the intention of the Church of England that there shall be no subscribers to them at all.*"

The speech proceeded. The general impression produced by it on the writer in the *Times* quoted above is thus recorded by him:—"Mr. Ward's speech occupied somewhat more than an hour. He spoke with remarkable rapidity, but at the same time with great calmness and self-possession—with the air of a man, in fact, who felt a deep conviction that he was right." It had in it little that was conciliatory. Even when his argument was strongest and most convincing, and his delivery most forcible, he would remind his hearers—*parenthetically*, as Professor Jowett tells me—that he held the "whole cycle of Roman doctrine." To its power many who remember it testify in strong terms. Stanley, who was standing near Jowett, said to him, "They would never have let Ward speak in English if they had known how well he could speak." But his whole defence implied and expressed as its sole ground the unwelcome

assumption of the hopelessly illogical character of the English Church. His judges were, he maintained, utterly unjustified, in all consistency of logic, in condemning him, because the Church to which they belonged was itself hopelessly inconsistent. If the rest of the Anglican formularies were consistent with the Articles, he had no *locus standi*. But amid a hopeless jumble of inconsistent pledges, he remained free and untrammelled;—and the Church remained convicted of folly and self-contradiction. The effect of the speech on the hostile majority is thus described by one of them:—

"His speech in defence," continues the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* already cited, ". . . was exceedingly well delivered; boldly, clearly, with great self-possession . . . but the matter seemed intended *auditores malevolos facere*. Every statement and every inference that could offend their prejudices, irritate their vanity, or wound their self-respect, was urged with the zeal of a candidate for martyrdom. In deference, he said, to the advice of his lawyer, he stated that his opinions had entirely changed since his subscription; and even if the case had been otherwise, he denied the legal right of Convocation to punish by degradation. These matters, however, (which were the strong points of his case), he passed over briefly. He then restated his full assent to all the doctrines of Rome; he restated his readiness to repeat his subscription; he repeated that he believed and was ready to subscribe to the Articles in a *non-natural* sense; and he affirmed that the *imponens* of subscription . . . intended that they should be so subscribed, for that, if the *imponens* did not so intend, he must have intended that they should not be subscribed at all. He contrasted the Articles in their natural sense with the Prayer-book, with each other, and with the common feelings and opinions of mankind; and then put it to his hearers, High Church and Low Church, Calvinistic and Armenian, whether their subscription was not as unnatural as his own."

"After all," wrote the late Canon Mozley, two days after the scene, "I really am astonished at the number of men and sort of men who supported Ward after such avowals as he made. It is really a phenomenon to me. If he said once, he said twenty times in the course of his speech, 'I believe all the doctrines of the Roman Church.'"

"The prohibition of English," continues the writer in the *Edinburgh*, "had its intended effect. Only one speech was attempted in Latin. In consequence of the position of the speaker in the area, and pressed on by a dense crowd, it was impossible to distinguish more than that he opposed the degradation on the ground that Mr. Ward's errors, if errors they were, were not errors

of infidelity. 'Nil dixit,' he exclaimed, 'Dominus Guglielmus Ward contra Deum optimum maximum, nil dixit contra Dei filium unigenitum, nil dixit contra spiritum sanctum.'[1] In other words, he said, my client never stole a lion, he never stole an elephant, he never stole a tiger,—that may be true, but he is indicted for stealing a sheep."

The speech over, the Vice-Chancellor put the question. "There was a roar and counter-roar of '*placets*' and '*non-placets*.' A scrutiny was then ordered," and the first resolution —the censure of the passages from the *Ideal*—was carried by 777 to 391; the second—the degradation—by a much smaller majority, 569 to 511. Then came the proposal for the condemnation of Tract 90. The Vice-Chancellor read the resolution. "But now the two Proctors rose," Mr. Guillemard and Mr. Church, the present Dean of St. Paul's, "and uttered . . . the words which, except on one memorable occasion [the Hampden case], no one now living had ever heard pronounced in Convocation." When the resolution was put, "a shout of '*non*' was raised, and resounded through the whole building, and '*placets*' from the other side, over which Guillemard's *nobis Procuratoribus non-placet* was heard like a trumpet and cheered enormously. The Dean of Chichester threw himself out of his doctor's seat and shook both Proctors violently by the hand,"[2] and, "without any formal dissolution, indeed, without a word more being spoken, as if such an interposition [as the Proctors' *veto*] stopped all business, the Vice-Chancellor tucked up his gown, and hurried down the steps that led from his throne into the area, and hurried out of the theatre; and in five minutes the whole scene of action was cleared."[3] Mr. Ward was cheered by the undergraduates as he left the theatre, and the Vice-Chancellor was saluted by hisses and snowballs from the same quarter. Ward walked back from the theatre in company with Tait, who had voted against him on the first count.[4]

[1] The speaker, of course, meant that if men like Hampden and Whately were not degraded for free-thought, degradation seemed over-severe for men whose errors fell short of free-thinking. But, as Dean Stanley says, "The time for argument was past. In that infuriated assembly, infuriated on both sides by the passions of the contending parties, action was the only course."

[2] Mozley's *Letters*, p. 165.

[3] *Edinburgh Review*, April 1845, p. 394.

[4] In the course of this walk Tait warmly praised the peroration of Mr. Ward's

It was noticed that Mr. Gladstone's *non-placet* was peculiarly vehement. He voted in Mr. Ward's favour on both propositions. All the Fellows of Balliol without exception supported Mr. Ward likewise in both votes.

In the course of the afternoon Ward went to see Dr. Pusey, who had been very sympathetic throughout. He began to discuss his anomalous position in the University—an *undergraduate* (for his degree was gone), and yet Fellow of Balliol. "They can't expect me to wear an undergraduate's cap and gown," he said; "I suppose I must wear my beaver." And he commenced some jocose anticipations of coming disputes with Dr. Jenkyns on the subject, when a voice from the other end of the room was heard to say in grave and measured accents: "The situation seems to me, Mr. Ward, to be one of the utmost gravity. It is indeed a serious crisis. Let us not at such a time give way to a spirit of levity or hilarity."

The speaker was Archdeacon Manning, who had voted for Mr. Ward, but whose first personal introduction to him was on this occasion.[1] Later in life he came, I think, to acquit Ward of levity, and to enjoy a joke in the course of their theological discussions. The acquaintance thus begun grew in after years to relations of cordial intimacy, which lasted to the end of Ward's life.

Several of Mr. Ward's friends were amused—though not surprised, as the Archdeacon of Chichester had been on the previous day—when, on coming early next morning to discuss with him the state of events, they found that besides a careful letter to the Vice-Chancellor and another to Roundell Palmer on the legal questions connected with his degradation, he had

speech, which consisted of an eloquent appeal to all those who loved the liberty which rightfully belonged to English Churchmen to make common cause with him. Mr. Ward had read the peroration, the rest of the speech being delivered without notes or manuscript. Ward's reply was characteristically candid: "I am glad you liked it. Those rhetorical efforts are out of my line; but Stanley said there should be something of the kind. He wrote it for me."

[1] This is the account I have often heard my father give of his first introduction to Cardinal Manning. The Cardinal tells us that in the conversation which ensued the doctrines of Lutheranism were discussed, and Mr. Ward repeated his opinion—expressed in the *Ideal*—that they were worse than atheism. The energy and intensity of expression in the *Ideal* suggested a retort to the Archdeacon, and he said, "The most Lutheran book I have ever read was called *The Ideal of a Christian Church*."

to show them some verses on the recent proceedings, which he sang to them, to the tune of some popular ballad.

The first verse was something of the following kind:—

"A system has been now devised
Which cannot be evaded;
And those who don't to it conform
Will forthwith be degraded."

The refrain consisted in a repetition of the word "degraded," first in the voice of Symons the Vice-Chancellor, then in that of Jenkyns of Balliol, and so on throughout the list of the most obnoxious of the Heads of Houses.

Mr. Ward's friends, who had been unceasingly active in endeavouring to avert his condemnation, now began fresh endeavours to obtain, by legal measures, a reversal of the sentence of Convocation. Roundell Palmer offered to take the matter in hand, and commenced forthwith the necessary proceedings. "I exerted myself," writes Lord Selborne, "to procure for him legal redress. It was thought (Mr. Bethell, afterwards Lord Westbury, concurring in that opinion) that the Convocation of the University had exceeded its jurisdiction by assuming cognisance of an (alleged) ecclesiastical offence by a clergyman of the Church of England." All the business matters connected with the case were, Mr. Ward said, "out of his line," and his friends undertook them, while he confined himself to the logical defence of his position. After the scene of the 13th, he revised his speech for publication, and, as I have said, wrote a careful letter to Dr. Symons. But various business papers were, apparently, despatched to Mr. Church of Oriel, with the following note:—

"MY DEAR CHURCH—Stanley says that you have kindly undertaken the work I asked him to do. Would you, with equal kindness, take the enclosed into your attention? I hope the trouble is not very great, but I don't understand such things.—Yours most truly, W. G. WARD, *Undergraduate*."

The feeling, for the few days succeeding the proceedings of Convocation, was decidedly in Mr. Ward's favour, until circumstances, which shall be later referred to, brought about a change. The subjoined letter gives the impressions of a contemporary as to the state of public opinion at the time.

It was written by a member of Convocation who had gone up to Oxford for the occasion.

"Poor Ward has lost the battle numerically, but we all feel that the moral effect is decidedly in his favour. His speech was too bold and too unvarnished to gain very many of such as could come up pledged to condemn him without having read his writings, and before they had heard his defence; but its very openness and honesty told with others. I know several residents who were turned by it; but the non-resident clergy are, I fear, too bigoted in the mass to listen to so repulsive an argument as that of the 'expansiveness of our Articles.'

"However, the legal question is now to come on, and Ward may yet triumph. He is publishing his speech, so you will see it in a fuller and more corrected form than the papers give. No. 90, I think, will be left untouched, but there is great apprehension of the Heads of Houses bringing on some test again; and, with Parliament to back them, they will probably succeed in carrying it, but not without a tremendous struggle. I earnestly hope the crisis may be delayed, for whatever happens in a period of great excitement is sure to cause many heart-burnings and bitter regrets afterwards, which can only prejudice the cause of unity and retard the progress of that event which we all have so much at heart."

Oakeley wrote to the Vice-Chancellor on the 14th, publicly committing himself to Mr. Ward's views of subscription. The letter led to consequences which he had not foreseen with reference to his own position in the English Church. But of this I must speak in a subsequent chapter.

On 15th February Newman wrote to Ward from Littlemore as follows:—

"LITTLEMORE, 15*th February* 1845.

MY DEAR WARD—I hoped to have sent you a line yesterday, but so many people came that it was impossible.

You cannot be taken by surprise at what has happened; yet I am a little anxious lest, when the excitement is over, you may perhaps suffer from it. I hope not indeed. That your part has been an important one in the course of events which are happening, though we are as yet too near to understand it, is beyond all doubt; and there is every reason to think it will not be less important in time to come. No decree of council or Convocation, unless a special divine power goes with it, can destroy opinion, or those who are the organs of it. It is impossible to anticipate things; but one may say, I trust, without presumption, that your course is only just begun. That it may ever be ruled and blessed

by a Higher Intelligence is the sincere prayer of, my dear Ward, yours very sincerely, JOHN H. NEWMAN.

"*P.S.*—Will you convey a kind remembrance of me to Oakeley. I feel very much for him just now; but I have very little or nothing which I could put into words."

I subjoin the text of Mr. Ward's letter to the Vice-Chancellor.

"BALLIOL COLLEGE, 13*th February* 1845.

MR. VICE-CHANCELLOR—I entertain so much respect for the authority of the House of Convocation, when acting within its legitimate province, that I think a statement of the reasons which lead me to consider my position in the University morally unaffected by what has passed to-day, is due to you, and to all who have been instrumental in promoting the censure voted against me. Of course I am not now referring to the act of degradation, the validity of which will be the subject of legal decision. I refer to the former of the two resolutions passed in Convocation—a resolution which, as it in effect pronounces certain theological propositions published by me (and to which I firmly adhere) inconsistent with the 39 Articles, might seem at first sight to impose upon me the obligation of voluntary retirement from all those rights and privileges within the University for which subscription to the 39 Articles is a qualification. Could I be satisfied that Convocation is the true *imponens* of the Articles upon members of the University, so as to be capable of authoritatively determining the sense in which they ought to be subscribed, I should not be disposed to inquire how far subscription is necessarily to be considered as a continuing act, nor should I hold myself at liberty to subscribe any longer in the sense which Convocation has repudiated. I should in that case at once relinquish my position in the University.

"But I think it will be obvious to every one that my duty under such circumstances must depend essentially upon the question whether Convocation is the true imposer, and the competent interpreter, of subscription or not. If not, it is plainly beyond the power of Convocation, either by the general condemnation of any particular modes of interpreting the Articles or by the express condemnation of that sense in which I myself subscribe, to acquire any moral authority over my conduct in this respect.

"If Convocation cannot rule affirmatively the sense in which members of the University shall subscribe, it necessarily follows that Convocation cannot rule negatively the sense in which members of the University shall not subscribe. Now it is well known that the question whether Convocation is legally capable of requiring members of the University to declare that they subscribe the Articles in a particular sense has been lately the subject of

consideration by legal authorities; and it has been held by those authorities (nor, as far as I know, has it been disputed by others) that the Articles are imposed, and the sense of subscription determined, by the law of the land; and that the judges of the Ecclesiastical Courts alone have the power authoritatively to declare that sense, while the Supreme Legislature alone has the power of altering or adding to it. Under these circumstances, great and sincere as is my respect for the House of Convocation, I cannot feel that any obligation whatever is laid upon me, in consequence of the events of this day, to act for the future upon any different view of subscription to the Articles from that on which I have hitherto acted, and which is expressed in my work and pamphlets.—I remain, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, your faithful Servant,

"WILLIAM GEORGE WARD."

## CHAPTER XIV

### COLLAPSE OF THE MOVEMENT

1845-1846

MR. WARD'S days in the Church of England were in reality numbered, although a lawsuit with respect to the validity of his degradation was impending. A state of things which he little dreamt of when he published the *Ideal*, had made him resolve to resign his Fellowship; and under such circumstances it was not ultimately thought worth while by his friends to pursue the proceedings with respect to his degradation.

A friendship with the sister of one of his Christ Church contemporaries, William Wingfield, and an *habituée* of Oakeley's beautiful services at Margaret Street, had grown unconsciously into something more than a friendship. Mr. Ward had first taken deacon's orders with no belief in their sacramental character. But even after his final ordination as a Newmanite, the anomalous state of the English Church seemed to him to throw such doubt upon the Episcopal succession, that he had never believed in the validity of his own orders. His views on clerical celibacy were therefore no bar to his marriage. Still, when it came to the alternative of breaking off a friendship which had been so much to him, and taking a step which must necessarily, in the excited state of feeling on every point in Catholic doctrine, be a shock to his supporters, he hesitated; and it was only the decided counsel of the men to whom he ever looked for advice in matters of duty, which determined him to act as he acted. Newman held that it was his vocation, as he felt it to be for his happiness, that the friendship should be allowed to become what it had fast been becoming.

Miss Frances Mary Wingfield was the youngest daughter

of the Rev. John Wingfield, D.D., one of the pluralists of byegone days, who held, among other preferments, a canonry of York, a prebendal stall at Worcester, and another living at Bromsgrove. She had long been a zealous Puseyite, and had followed Mr. Ward's career with all the sympathy which was natural in a disciple of Oakeley. They were engaged to be married in the winter of 1844, on the eve of the events described in the last chapter. It was thought advisable, considering the exasperated state of public feeling, that the engagement should not be publicly known until after the proceedings of 13th February. It was not a time at which the public mind would be disposed to take a fair view of the subject; and the broad fact that the English clergyman who advocated clerical celibacy was himself about to marry, would be a more effective weapon in the hands of his opponents than the more complicated and personal considerations by which individual duty is decided, could be for his friends. In calmer times the case might have been otherwise. John Wesley advocated clerical celibacy, and yet thought that his own circumstances and character warranted him in marrying. And though he had not even the plea which Mr. Ward had, that he did not regard his orders as assured, or his vocation to be that of a priest, we do not hear of his marriage being criticised. But December 1844 was a moment of intense excitement and consequent unfairness on all sides in the English Church. The party could not risk the possible consequences of disclosure, and the engagement was not divulged until the great day of Mr. Ward's trial before the University was past.

It was a nine days' wonder, and a year or two later, when Mr. Ward had become a Catholic layman, probably very few disapproved of it. But at the moment it destroyed the effectiveness of the Tractarian position before the eyes of the public.[1] Those whose opinion and friendship Mr. Ward most valued—Newman, Oakeley, Stanley—were, as I have said,

[1] Stanley, in the essay already cited in the text, refers to Ward's marriage as the collapse of the Movement. I give in this chapter some of the other events which might be said to have indicated or caused its collapse—the decision of the Ecclesiastical Courts on the Stone Altar case, the proceedings with reference to Margaret Street, etc. Whatever may have been the immediate occasion, however, of the collapse, Newman's known intention of leaving the Church of England must have been the chief *cause*,—the destruction of its motive principle.

strongly in favour of it. "I anticipate nothing but good and happiness on all sides," Oakeley wrote, and Stanley's approval and pleasure are emphatically recorded in one of Ward's letters to his *fiancée*. Under these circumstances the disapproval of comparative strangers affected him little. An extract may be here inserted from a letter addressed to his *fiancée* on Palm Sunday 1845, indicating the state of feeling on all sides—

[He speaks of a feeling of solitariness] "partly from the impression on my mind that [my friends] so much disapprove what I have done. I don't mean that I am at all incapacitated from attending to my duties; rather, I think, there will be so much of loneliness as to make this a really and energetically penitential week, but not *too* much for that object, *i.e.* not so much as seriously to overwhelm me. I have a great notion that I am now so much rested from my fatigues and excitements that I am quite fitted (not indeed for anything like my average amount of exertion, but still) for a more energetic life than I have been leading for the last four weeks; and I think this week will be an inestimably valuable preparation for such a course. . . . Some expressions in the meditation which I arranged to read with you yesterday (but which I am sorry to say I was not able to read till to-day, having had too great a headache yesterday to have time for it . . .) some expressions, I say, in that meditation have been leading me to think how desirable it is that there should be more devotional books than I happen to know of written for the use of those who are married or about to be married, or again may have very specially intimate friends; because in so many unspeakably important ways (as I remember expressing to you) we are a type of the Church to each other, and a refuge and protection *against* the world, rather than *part* of the world; while yet on the other hand, of course, there *is* need of constant effort that we go on more and more to love each other *in* Christ and not *out* of Him, if I may so speak. . . . I have had long talks with Macmullen, Observer Johnson, Stanley, and Wall. I find that the more common objection has been not to the marriage, but to the time of its announcement, though many unite with that the opinion that I ought not . . . to have published my book. J. Keble is *much pained*, and Archdeacon Manning *extremely* so. . . . J. Morris, on the other hand, seems to have been consistently kind and apologetic. Scott of our College (a *very* good man, but whose judgment I must confess I very little value) *simply approves*: but I can hear of no one else who has done so—except Richards and Marriott. I have been very much surprised to find how little all this has affected me. I mean that though I always knew it could have no tendency to shake my own conviction, still I expected in proportion as the amount of

disapprobation should be impressed on my imagination that I should be a good deal distressed; whereas except so far as the feeling of desolateness to which I above alluded is traceable to it, it has had no such effect or tendency whatever. Temple I forgot to mention;—he, you may remember, is that Fellow of ours who said he should now be very long before he again read the *Ideal*, which he *had* considered a *real* book. On Friday night I had a long talk with him . . . and argued the matter out. I did not, as I told him, press for an immediate conclusion in his mind. . . . *Sunday evening.* The party [at Observer Johnson's] went off very briskly. None of the company wished me joy, and Church's manner at *entering was decidedly cool:* but they abstained with particular care from severe allusions; only the Observer uttered many jokes which were quite good-natured and harmless. . . ."

Again he writes on Good Friday—nine days before his marriage. He speaks of being troubled, during Holy week, by temptations against Faith. "My brain always gets into more or less of knots and perplexities," he says, "when I am left to myself so much as during this Holy week (for unlike you it is not good for me being too much by myself, except on rare occasions), and this year there has been more of that, from having passed the rest of Lent so absolutely at rest and without preparation for the last week of it."

"On Monday and Tuesday in particular I suffered very much in spirits. . . . However, upon the whole, I have spent, I trust, a very profitable (if not a very happy, which it has not been) week. And if it has been (as you say is your own case this Lent) less carefully kept than in some former years, this is quite accounted for by my exhaustion and over-work up to 13th February, and by absence of preparation since that time. One important thing I have begun, and I hope regularly to continue, viz., to put down in *writing* each day the results of the self-examination of the previous day, both general and particular, the latter mentioning even very slight instances of one's *besetting* sin or sins. . . .

"You know I am to wear your chain to-morrow. I shall appear quite resplendent in Easter novelty of dress."

Mr. Ward was married on 31st March 1845. He and Mrs. Ward took a small cottage at Rose Hill, in the vicinity of Oxford. The legal proceedings for the restoration of his degrees were not at once abandoned. Lord Selborne, who was acting for him, tells me that Ward himself never from the first took any interest in them, though he was prepared to do whatever might be thought advisable, and useful to the public

cause he represented. In April 1845 he was advised to claim his right to sit in Convocation as a Master of Arts, on the ground that his degradation was illegal. He consented, but wished to confine himself to the assertion of his rights and to create as little disturbance as possible. He wrote as follows to the present Dean of St. Paul's on the subject on 21st April 1845.

"MY DEAR CHURCH—R. Palmer, I just find, mentioned to you that I was likely to appear in Convocation on Thursday. I should feel, however, most particularly obliged, if you could possibly do so, if you would not mention it more than you can help, as I am very anxious that there should not be a *scene* on the occasion, but that all should be transacted as quietly as possible.—Yours ever most truly, W. G. WARD."

Meanwhile, however, the definite line which the rulers of the Anglican Church were adopting with regard to the Romanisers was bringing matters to the final crisis. The authorities were now thoroughly roused. The decision of the Ecclesiastical Courts in the celebrated Stone Altar case—a decision which condemned the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, came soon after the sentence of Convocation upon Mr. Ward; and in the summer of 1845 a blow was struck at Mr. Oakeley's connection with Margaret Street, which in the event proved to be the dissolution of the last tie which had kept Mr. Ward in the Anglican communion. The events connected with Margaret Street shall be related in Mr. Oakeley's own words:—

"A blow was struck at Margaret Chapel, and its disorganisation added to the other events by which the progress of Tractarianism was discouraged. The minister, who had for some time committed himself to Mr. Ward's view of subscription to the Articles, and who felt that in the recent vote of the Oxford Convocation a wound had been inflicted upon himself which rendered his position extremely difficult in conscience, resolved upon bringing matters to an issue by drawing attention to his own published statements, and offering to abide by the consequences. His challenge was taken up, not where he had given it, at Oxford, but where he did not think that it would be noticed, in London. Had he left matters to rest as they were, no prosecution could probably have been sustained against him, because the words complained of were published out of the limits of the London diocese. But his good angel prompted him to write a defence of his challenge, and to publish it in

London, which at once gave his vigilant diocesan a handle against him. A suit was accordingly instituted, on behalf of the bishop, in the Court of Arches. Fearful of being a party to the profane discussion of doctrines which he had already begun to regard with somewhat of Catholic reverence, and weary of a strife which he looked upon as unbecoming in itself and hopeless in its result, he voluntarily tendered the resignation of his license. The bishop, however, was not to be propitiated, and refused to accept his resignation. The suit was actively followed up, and, as the defendant absolutely declined to put in any plea on his own behalf, judgment went by default. The judge, however, unwilling to lose so good an opportunity of entering the protest of the highest Ecclesiastical Court against what were called 'Romanising opinions,' pronounced a condemnation of Catholic doctrines *seriatim*.

"The court gave sentence to the effect that the minister should be perpetually suspended, except in the event of his retracting the alleged errors in terms satisfactory to the bishop."

Dr. Pusey, naturally discouraged and pained at the repeated reverses of the party, owing to the indiscreet action—as he considered it—of the advanced school, appears to have remonstrated with Oakeley for his impetuosity on the occasion. The following letter from Mr. Ward, written to Dr. Pusey at an early stage in the controversy—in March 1845—tells its own story:—

"Oakeley is so very much engrossed just now with occupations connected with the present crisis in his life, that he has asked me to answer your letter, which he has put into my hands for that purpose. Of course Margaret Chapel has been to him so thoroughly his one strongest (in a certain sense we might say *only*) earthly tie, that the idea of parting from it (as he said to me the other day) is like a person losing his nearest and dearest friend or relative: it was what he had always looked to as the severest trial to which he could by any possibility have been exposed. It has been a matter of daily increasing astonishment with me how well and quietly he has borne it, and how wonderfully his powers seem to have risen under the pressure of circumstances to meet the crisis as it came. I think his two letters to the Bishop of London are the most powerful works he has ever written. I wish to mention merely as a fact that your letter has been the one thing which has given him by far the greatest pain of any circumstance that has befallen him; and he particularly desires me to say that he cannot, after it, feel at present so much disposed as he was to write openly to you, and ask your advice and sympathy when beset by public troubles.

"Of course you understand that I am simply writing you this

as a message from him; as it would be most unbecoming in myself to express any sort of opinion on the subject. All that I purpose doing in what remains of space is to put before you one or two considerations which perhaps have not occurred to you, as illustrative of the reasons which have made it appear to him a duty to act as he has acted; or again, as tending to show that you have more or less misapprehended what has been his precise course.

"Unless you were on the spot, you could have no idea of the *anguish* of mind which has been caused in the minds of many gentle and humble souls at the idea of his leaving [Margaret Chapel]. My own knowledge of London folk is of course comparatively very limited; but I may mention two cases. One lady, a very old friend of mine, some years older than myself, came back to her home (where I was waiting to speak to her) in such an agony of grief that I thought she must have lost some very near relation. It was the one thing, she said, which had made life supportable to her. I may mention that so far from having Roman tendencies, she has the *greatest dread* of the idea of going to Rome. Isaac Williams is the writer who delights her most (next, that is, to Oakeley, and perhaps to Newman), and the very thing which delighted her in Oakeley's ministrations was that she received much invaluable *practical* guidance (as to keeping Lent, daily examination, etc. etc.), without being annoyed and bewildered by the introduction of controversy and polemics. She is in a very doubtful state of health; I can quite conceive that the result of this business may make to her the difference of living or dying. The other case is that of another lady whom I now know extremely well (being engaged to be married to her), who considers Oakeley to have been by far her greatest benefactor in the whole world; indeed, it is her own expression that words would fail to express the greatness of her obligation to him. Her mind was originally moulded on a strictly Anglican model (her father having been a High Churchman of the old school, and *Jeremy Taylor's* works having been the centre of her faith and devotion), and she bears most express testimony to this (and she has been in the habit of regular *confession* to [Oakeley]), that the whole of his training has tended singularly to *discourage* any abandonment of her old habits, or even any party *addition* to them of new ones; and that her present very predominant taste for the *early* centuries (being pained by the addresses to St. Mary in the latter) has been strengthened and drawn out by his whole teaching.

"I mention these two cases as that of persons concerning whom *I have a most intimate knowledge.* I believe Richards could tell you a great multitude of cases very similar; while I very much doubt whether a single instance could be specified which even to the most prejudiced observer could present the appearance of any one being

pressed forward into opinions or observances for which he is not prepared.

"Surely, again, it is hardly correct to think that the pulpit is the only place in which Oakeley does not put forward (distinctively) Roman doctrine. He avows that he holds it, and there he leaves it. All his practical works display an anxious desire to accommodate the truth to the existing attainments of his readers or hearers.

"As to the reasons which have induced [Oakeley] and myself to make plain statements on the subject, I would suggest (1) that, believing as we do, that parts of our formularies must be most violently distorted in order to admit our views (as they must, we contend, in order to admit *any* definite views), we could not be easy in our conscience if we subscribed them *without publicly proclaiming the sense in which we subscribe them*, and challenging those who dissent to try the question in the Ecclesiastical Courts if they so please; and (2) that, believing that nothing short of full Roman doctrine will meet the wants of many as they advance in holiness, we think it a positive duty that such persons should know of others who may be like-minded with themselves, and not be kept back from what we fully believe to be the truth by an idea of undutifulness to our Church, or to their instructors *in* our Church.

"I don't at this moment observe anything else in your letter to which it is necessary for me, in his behalf, to refer. As a matter of fact, Mr. B. Noel is *precisely* in the same position with regard to license, etc., as [Oakeley] is. [Oakeley] is my authority for this.

"In justice to [Oakeley], I ought to say that as far as such an one as myself can judge on such a matter, he seems to me perfectly *wonderful* as to the sweetness and equableness of temper with which he has taken the whole business. His nights at present are perfectly tranquil, while he works most energetically the whole day. He thinks of going for a few weeks into the country in search of repose, which he so much needs. Perhaps you would kindly *reserve* any comment you may have to make until that period has elapsed, as any additional trial, not absolutely necessary, must be so prejudicial. For myself, may I make the same request? For very different reasons, I am perfectly overwrought with either labour or anxiety of mind, and shall be far more able to profit really by any admonition you may wish to address me if you would wait for a few weeks. . . .

"I may be allowed to say that, as far as my humble judgment goes, there has not been hitherto so important a crisis in our Church as this of Marg. Chap. You have literally no idea of the interest which has been taken. *Judge Coleridge, the Bishop of Lichfield, Judge Patterson, Gladstone*, etc. etc. have written to the Bishop in [Oakeley's] favour; it is not impossible that the *Archbishop of York* means to do

the same. If you read [Oakeley's] *second* letter to the Bishop, you will see some *very* strong expressions from ladies and others of his flock, which are *independent* of the cases I have mentioned to you. If [Oakeley's] second letter *comes out* (which is not certain) he will send it to you."

Oakeley's resignation and the decision of the Ecclesiastical Court took place in the summer of 1845. The Stone Altar case had been a little earlier. Newman had at last intimated to his friends that he no longer felt that peace in the Anglican ordinances which had so long sustained him, in spite of all his misgivings, in the Church of his birth. His final separation from that Church was only a matter of time. The fetters which bound Mr. Ward himself to the Church of England were being one by one unlocked. He scarcely knew it, but it was so; and next time he moved they fell to the ground.

He was writing an article on Blanco White's newly published life, and Mrs. Ward was copying it for press. In this article the Church of Rome was recognised by him, as it had been for the last two or three years, as *the* true Church. Mrs. Ward, to whom the attitude of an Anglican who absolutely believed in the Church of Rome as the one true Church was a new one, broke down as soon as she had copied half the article. "I cannot stand it," she said, "I shall go and be received into the Catholic Church." His wife's resolution led Mr. Ward to look for a moment at his own condition. One glance was enough. The fetters, as I have said, were unlocked; he had but to move and they were gone. He had long held that the Roman Church was the one true Church. He had gradually come to believe that the English Church was not strictly a part of the Church at all. He had felt bound to retain his external communion with her members, because he believed that he was bringing many of them towards Rome; and to unite himself to the Church which he loved and trusted, to enjoy the blessings of external communion for himself, if by so doing he thwarted this larger and fuller victory of truth, had seemed a course both indefensible and selfish.

Still he had long looked on his present position as only a time of waiting, as a season of purgatory, as the painful and laborious seed-sowing, endured patiently because of the harvest to come. It was years since he had

written that restoration of communion with the one Catholic Church and the See of Peter was "the most enchanting earthly prospect on which his imagination could dwell." He had become accustomed to a position similar to that of the missionary, who forgoes the happiness of living among his brethren in the faith, often of approaching the sacraments, of the sustaining and health-giving presence of Church liturgy and ordinances, in order that he may lead strangers to see the truth, and to enjoy eventually in his company those helps and blessings which he foregoes for the moment for their sake. He listened to the voice of the Church, believed her decrees, reverenced her saints. It was for him the land of promise; but the journey to it, the path of duty which had to be trodden before he could reach it, had seemed long, and he had resigned himself to waiting.

Now, however, a change had come. The party for whose sake he was waiting had swerved from their course, and the conditions which justified him in outward separation from the Church seemed to be gone. The High Church party had marked its disapproval of his views. He could not serve them by staying. The English Church called for a sacrifice to its divinity as a pledge that he was not a Roman Catholic. The leader, whose sanctity and example had been his mainstay in the Anglican communion, whose peace of conscience had calmed his own difficulties in the situation, had said "this is not the place for us. We must go hence." The time of missionary labour and of seed-sowing was over. He was free to follow his own heart, to go in company with those who had been true to their principles to the one Church of Christ. When his wife announced her intention, he saw at once how the case stood. "A little sooner or a little later makes no difference," he said, "I will go with you."

Those who have followed step by step the struggles of Mr. Ward's mind, will in some measure understand the new world which opened out before him, when he had realised that it was lawful and more than lawful for him to unite himself to the Catholic Church. It had been a long and painful struggle, filled with new hopes and repeated disappointments. There had been at first the trial caused by the intellectual perplexities of the Anglican position, and the

moral deadness of the establishment of 1830. Then came the first season of hope from the manly earnestness of Arnoldism. For a time he was contented and sanguine; but intellectual dissatisfaction arose and grew more and more urgent, until it assumed proportions alarmingly suggestive of the demon of total scepticism. Following this was the new-born hopefulness when in 1838 he thought he had found an interpretation of the English Church which would support him in company with Newman and Froude. Then came his gradual disappointment as the dissipation of the party and the action of Church authority in the case of Tract 90 showed the unreality of his new position. His old pain and distress at the characteristics of Anglicanism returned. It was too painfully proved to be that very religion against which he had revolted three years earlier, and not the mediæval dream of Froude's *Remains*. Lastly, there was the dawn of the vision of the Church of Rome as the only realisation of that dream; the steady and ever-increasing light of this new belief; the final certainty that he had at last found the haven he was in search of; and then the accompanying conviction that though he might see it in the distance, his call was elsewhere; that when at last he had found the answer to his cry for "true guidance in return for loving obedience," he might only follow the guidance at a distance, and had not the means of obeying in full! He had perforce to rest content to endure his chains for an indefinite time, and to work cheerfully in prison if that was his duty, refusing, like Socrates, to purchase freedom at the cost of disobedience to his conscience.

The prisoner loves to picture, and perhaps even idealises, the freedom and happiness of those whom he sees outside, through the bars which confine him, enjoying to the full liberty of life and limb; and the true lover's devotion and enthusiasm are intensified by difficulty and increased by delay. Mr. Ward, as we have seen, had dwelt for years in heart and spirit in the Catholic Church with the feelings of a prisoner and the devotion of a lover. He knew its theology, it may fairly be said, better than any Catholic in England. "For breadth, depth, and thoroughness of theological reading and knowledge," said the great Jesuit theologian, F. O'Reilly, a very few years later, "I have never met his equal." He

recited its liturgy constantly; he studied its devotional literature unceasingly. The existing Catholic Church had to him all the romance which days of chivalry have to the youthful readers of Sir Walter Scott; and to be a part of her and live in contact with her was to him in idea what the imaginative schoolboy pictures when he longs to cross swords with Brian de Bois Guilbert, or to witness the mortal combat between the Black Knight and Front de Bœuf.

The Church had to him this charm over and above the deep intellectual and moral rest and peace which it promised him; and none of those who knew him accused him of exaggeration when he spoke of the torture which Protestantism caused him, or when he described the one week in which he had mixed with Catholics and joined in the liturgy at Grace Dieu and Mount St. Bernard as the happiest week in his life. The "exterior of polite indifference," the "cold, cramping, stifling uniformity," grew more than ever intolerable. I do not think it is fanciful to trace a connection between his love of liberty and hatred of oppression, on the one hand, and his love of Catholicism and hatred of the Anglican system on the other. Freedom, fresh air, elasticity of mind, these were congenial to his temperament on physical and mental sides alike. His idea of misery was being confined in a stuffy room, and he had a morbid dread—witnessed in his directions to his friends with reference to his burial—of being buried alive. The intellectual torture which most oppressed his imagination was being bound to submit to an inconsistent philosophy. In each case there seems to be the conception of unnatural cramping and oppression.

He was ready to have a field of action marked out for him, and to avoid forbidden ground. But *in* the field allowed him he required perfect freedom. The quicksand of Anglican Church authority stifled him. What was its basis? It disowned infallibility, yet it claimed obedience. It said "we may be wrong," yet it added, "you must think we are right." There was no finality in such a position. It left everything unsettled and a thousand questions unanswered. The idea, on the other hand, of certain matters decided by authority, in which detailed questioning was forbidden *because* the authority was infallible, supported him. It marked out his sphere, and left him freedom in that sphere. The perplexity of unanswered

questions was avoided by a very sufficient reason why the questions should be unasked. Again, the endless variety of the liturgical and devotional side of the Church gave him a sense of freedom. The spirit which has allowed free scope to hundreds of religious orders whose characteristics are widely different; the spirit which allowed him to choose his own special patrons, his own special prayers, his own congenial form of meditation, in place of following the uniform external prayers of the Establishment; that spirit which, as Lord Macaulay has reminded us, leads the Catholic Church to enroll the originality of enthusiasm in its ranks, as contrasted with the spirit which leads Protestants to reject fresh accesses of religious life as dangerous and foreign to it,—all this savoured of life and variety, and attracted one whose life was so exuberant, and whose character was so many sided. There was richness in the Catholic soil on which he throve, though he drew hard and fast—more so than many other Catholics—the lines which marked off forbidden ground of speculation or forbidden fields of action.

Before actually taking the final step he circulated among his acquaintances a letter to a friend, setting forth in characteristically dry and logical form the skeleton and formal argument on which a movement bound up with the fullest expression of his whole nature was intellectually defended by him. The letter was couched in the following terms:—

"ROSE HILL, OXFORD, 13*th August* 1845.

"MY DEAR ——, I proceed to execute the design I mentioned to you in my last, of putting on paper the considerations which have induced me to resolve on uniting myself to the communion of the Roman Catholic Church, notwithstanding some passages in the *Ideal* which seem to express strongly an opposite intention. Any one who will take the trouble to read carefully what I have said on the subject—especially in the last chapter of my work—will see plainly that I have grounded the (alleged) duty of remaining in the English Church on two principal circumstances: —1st, that there is nothing to hinder any one in our church, who may please, from holding all Roman doctrine; and 2d, that all those who, being in doubt of the English Church's claims, have resolved on living a stricter life in her communion, have found an ever-increasing strength and support in her ordinances. (See especially from p. 567 to p. 570). Now it is plain that both these circumstances have ceased to exist. That the latter has ceased to

exist no one, of course, who knows what is so generally known at present [about Newman's state of mind] will question. That the former also has ceased to exist is no less certain. If the bishops, speaking authoritatively, *ex cathedrâ*, be the official exponents of the mind of the Church of England, the point has been ruled against the 'Romanisers' long ago: if (as I myself have always thought) the Ecclesiastical Courts hold that function, the doctrines I hold have been equally condemned. Not to lay stress here on the decision in Mr. Oakeley's case (though I must for myself consider that decision final, notwithstanding the absence of defence on Mr. Oakeley's part, if no one takes up the gauntlet, and challenges a fresh decision, with the intention of making a formal defence, but not to lay stress on this decision), in the 'Stone Altar' case, a case most energetically argued on both sides, and most deliberately decided, the doctrine of the mass was expressly condemned; and if that doctrine be not a most essential and vital part of Roman doctrine, what can be so considered? It will be urged in reply that laymen are not ordinarily obliged to sign the Articles, and that, taking these decisions at their worst, they in no way interfere with a person holding all Roman doctrine in our Church's communion, so only we hold no preferment or ecclesiastical station. The utter futility, however, of this reply will be made obvious, by reciting the grounds on which it appeared to me so important that the holding of Roman doctrine should be permitted in our Church; and that my grounds were such as I shall proceed to mention will be very evident on a perusal of my work.

"It appeared to me, on the one hand, that all the arguments which, so far as I knew, were adduced in disproof of Roman doctrine, proceeded on an assumption which, if valid at all, is equally valid in disproof of Theism itself. (See *e.g.*, pp. 482-508). On the other hand, I had been placed by God in our own communion, and in that communion had received instruction in great Christian principles; as, first of all, through the agency of Dr. Arnold, so afterwards, in a very far greater degree, and with very far less admixture of error on the one side and perplexity on the other, from Mr. Newman. I knew nowhere of the recognition of a higher *idea* of Christian sanctity than I found recognised in our own Church; and all those whom I so deeply revered, so far as I then knew, found (as I just now observed) our ordinances the more trustworthy in proportion as they lived a stricter life. On such grounds as these to remain *in* our communion seemed the plain unmistakable dictate of modesty and sobriety; while, on the other hand, I should have been so absolutely puzzled at being called upon to view the Roman Church as authoritatively teaching error that, had I obliged myself to do so, it would have been necessary by main force to divert my mind from speculating on theological subjects at all.

"In such circumstances it was natural, or rather inevitable, to fall back on the sort of theory contained in my work. I was led, I say, naturally to such considerations as the following:—'The progress from error to truth cannot be made in one leap: persons cannot, on the mere word of an external authority, embrace at once a whole class of new doctrines, foreign, and at first even repugnant, to their moral nature. The doctrines again to which I allude are but accessories to the central verities of the Gospel—not those verities themselves—and will follow in due time, in proportion as those verities are rightly believed, heartily embraced, and fed on by prayer and contemplation. The English Church, then, at present, witnessing as it does those truths in its formularies, but silent, to say the least, on these accessories, does seem a providential ordinance adapted to prepare minds by degrees for the doctrine and communion of Rome.' Almost every page of my work, I might say, will show that this is the view I there advocated.

"That such a course of conduct, *if avowed*, was a course consistent with perfect honesty and integrity cannot, I conceive, be questioned. As to subscription to the Articles, I have no wish to enter again into a worn-out controversy; but I believe as firmly as ever that no consistent person, of whatever opinions, can subscribe all our formularies without offering the greatest violence to the natural meaning of language; and considering that the existing Church, in some shape or other, is necessarily the *imponens*, however grievous a burden such formularies must be to any community, I do not think any one need scruple in offering that violence, whether with the view of reconciling the Articles to Roman or the Prayer-book to Lutheran opinions, so long as he says plainly, in the face of day, what sense he *does* attach to the words, and remains without interference from constituted authorities. But in my case my opinions were not only avowed,—they were most conspicuously (many say with even an ostentatious parade) put forward. I called on 'High Churchmen' of various grades to combine in the object of impressing more deeply on the minds of our people the great truths to which I just alluded, and which they all profess, and willingly staked the truth of my own further opinions on the result. I was, and am, most undoubtingly confident that nothing is more necessary to dispose people fully for the reception of all Roman doctrine, when brought before them, than a hearty, unsuspicious, and laborious appropriation of that portion of truth plainly witnessed by our Church. I might here, then, allude to the additional reason for giving up the hopes I entertained when I wrote my work, which arises from the undeniable fact that 'Anti-Roman High Churchmen' have shown no sort of willingness (quite the reverse) to unite with what are called 'extreme' persons on any such terms. But my present purpose is merely to point out

how completely the decision of the Ecclesiastical Courts has destroyed whatever there might otherwise have been of plausibility in the theory I maintained as to the office of our Church.

"I say, then, that however plausible such a theory might have appeared so long as the holding of all Roman doctrine was allowed to be an open question among our clergy, not a word more need be said to prove how utterly extravagant it became, from the moment that all the instructors of our people were bound to renounce some part of that doctrine. It requires certainly a very enthusiastic hoper to imagine that our Church could really be made extensively available for the object supposed, when every one who entered on her ministry, or received a degree at either University, was called upon to renounce that object, as inconsistent with the claims of religious truth.

"I have made it, I trust, sufficiently plain that, supposing me still to agree in every sentiment I expressed in my work, nothing which I have said constitutes any defence for remaining in my present position. *My defence was grounded on two main supports: both these supports have given way.* But I am bound to add that most firm, unmoved, and, as I believe, immovable as is my conviction of the main principles advocated in the *Ideal*, there is one incidental opinion, of considerable importance to the present question, on which my views *have* undergone a change. To show that this change is rather in the application of principles than in principles, allow me to quote a passage from the last chapter in my work. 'He who is thus disciplined, who feels deeply his exceeding blindness, helplessness, and ignorance, and the existence without him of an unknown and unspeakably precious reality, will eagerly believe and appropriate whatever is placed before him in the course of nature, professing to be a voice from, or an economical representation of, that reality. Again he will have fully learnt, etc. etc. . . . From all this it will follow, as a primary axiom, that . . . should his parents have brought him into connection with some body professing to teach with authority, so long as he is able to repose unchanged confidence in that body, it is that very oracle for the conveyance to him of eternal truths, before which duty requires him to bow. Should the case be otherwise in a heathen country, he will be able to discriminate with precision between the right and the wrong in traditionary superstitions, and will thus elicit confirmation of his faith, and accessories to it, even out of corruptions of the truth. But rather would he anticipate that there is some home in which this moral reality may have a secure rest and lodgment, that it may be dispensed to men according to their needs; or at least he would be drawn with a most eager and spontaneous longing towards any body which would profess to be that home. And those marks, in any society, would especially

attract his view which appear to be most kindred in their nature and origin to eternal truth itself; for instance, to use ecclesiastical language, *unity* in doctrine throughout all ages; *sanctity, catholicity*, its proclaiming one and the same message to all lands; *apostolicity* its referring back to some signal interference with the visible course of things from the world beyond the veil' (pp. 510-511).

"The principles here expressed, if sufficiently considered, would have prevented me, I think, from supporting myself in the English Church on the theory which I have been drawing out; and I should add that Mr. Newman took an early opportunity of expressing to me his disapprobation of that theory. Observe distinctly that I am not speaking of those who (like myself, indeed) are unable to recognise any definite teaching whatever in the English Church, but who (unlike myself) find in the Roman doctrines, as apprehended by them, things which (I do not say merely call for an enlarged measure of faith, but which) offer actual and serious violence to their moral nature; what is *their* duty is a matter altogether distinct. Much less am I saying a word in disparagement of the principle I have so earnestly advocated throughout my work, viz., that it is the duty of all persons to accept heartily, conscientiously, and *practically*, in the *first instance*, the religious system they are taught. But I say, in my own case, that I think I was called upon *either* to look on the Church of England as my teacher, *or* to unite myself to the communion of the Church of Rome; and not to devise theories under which I might look on one Church as my teacher, while I remained in communion with another.

"Now it is a considerable time since Mr. Newman's writing and teaching (however edifying I found it in all other respects) altogether failed to commend itself to me as being in the least exponential of any teaching of the English Church. Indeed, during that time, I might have seen that I was deceiving myself in thinking that I *did* simply follow his teaching; for, whereas he strenuously disavowed any authority *except* as interpretative of the voice of the English Church,—when I was unable to accord him that claim, I was unable to follow his teaching in that very particular which he himself represented as constituting his only right to teach.

"I should add, too, that additional thought and experience have much increased my sense (which before, indeed, was very great) of the extreme importance of a living and energising dogmatic system. If the claims of such a system long remain unrecognised among us, I hardly know how to express, without appearing to exaggerate, how great are my fears as to the miserable errors into which even well-intentioned and right-minded persons may be led in the course of inquiry and speculation. Nor need I say how serious an addition this constitutes to the many other grave phenomena which seem clamorously to enforce on us all the duty of reviewing very care-

fully, and weighing very accurately, the reasons adducible in defence of our present position. Nothing, indeed, can be more pregnant with mischief than any step rashly and lightly undertaken, however good in itself. For my own part, though my present convictions are not consciously owing to any external impulse, but are the natural result of my own thought and observation, it seems, nevertheless, a duty to make plain to others as well as to myself that they are stable and genuine convictions, by refraining from any irrevocable step until there may be time for my intentions to become known wherever they would be really cared for, and for any arguments or remonstrances to be duly weighed. At the same time I should be hypocritical if I affected to think it likely that my determination will be altered by anything I shall hear said against it.—I remain, my dear ——, most sincerely yours,

"W. G. WARD."

Mr. and Mrs. Ward were received into the Catholic Church in September 1845 by Father Brownbill, S.J., in the Jesuit Chapel in Bolton Street, the precursor of the present Farm Street Church. They had come up to London for the occasion, and had taken lodgings in Half Moon Street. News, however, of the day and hour at which they were to be received had reached Oxford, and very free expressions of University opinion found their way to Half Moon Street on that morning. The new converts had gone to the church early, had made their general confession to Father Brownbill and received communion, and on their return found the breakfast table literally covered with squibs and more serious expressions of disapproval from Fellows and undergraduates. Among others was a parody of a well-known poem commencing thus:—

"O Wardie, I believed thee true,
And I was blessed in so believing,
But now I own I never knew
A youth so base or so deceiving."

Mr. Ward enjoyed the pasquinades thoroughly, and the more serious remonstrances did not trouble him. The gain of peace and rest, and of much more which a Catholic only can understand, placed him beyond the reach of any feelings of regret from personal misunderstandings. His friend Father Whitty came that day to luncheon, and describes him as full of the relief which confession had been to him, and of the tact displayed by Father Brownbill in making easy a review of the

whole of his past life, and anticipating such parts of the confession as might be difficult. "And he showed such knowledge of human nature," he remarked. "He told Mrs. Ward to make a retreat and to practice certain austerities: but he told me to unbend my mind as much as possible, and go to the play as often as I could."

They returned to Rose Hill, Oxford, and lived in their little cottage there on a very slender income for nearly a year. Father Whitty paid them a visit there in the summer of 1846, and met Oakeley, who had followed Mr. Ward within two months. "Their whole tone of mind and perfect simplicity of piety," he says, "reminded me of sketches one reads of the early Christians. They were perfectly full of the great cause, of the Church, of working for England's conversion, and seemed to care not at all for mere gossip or private matters."

Mrs. Ward officiated as cook—not always with great success. On one occasion a friend had sent them a haunch of venison, and they at once summoned their friends to partake of so unwonted a luxury. Mrs. Ward studied deeply the mysteries of venison-cookery in her book of receipts, and decided on a venison pasty. The science was, I believe, mastered completely, but the art, alas! would not come without a few rehearsals, and the first attempt proved a failure. The Neophytes were unable to eat the venison at all. Mr. Oakeley was the first to taste it, and on being asked by the anxious cook what it was like, said it reminded him of a cold wet blanket. The company had to be content with a rather meagre supply of bacon and nothing else. But they were too much absorbed in conversation on the stirring events of the year to notice such things. The idea of a great enterprise, a great mission, seems to have been very vivid among them all. They spoke of themselves after the manner of the Jacobites of the last century—as "those who went out in '45." Divine office was said daily by many of them; and Father Whitty recalls the recital of vespers after luncheon in the coffee-room of the Angel Hotel at Oxford, in which he and Mr. and Mrs. Ward performed the functions of the alternate choirs.

The new converts were confirmed by Cardinal (then Bishop) Wiseman at Oscott, and at one time thought of taking up their residence in the neighbourhood permanently. Ulti-

mately, however, Old Hall was determined upon, in the vicinity of the College of St. Edmund, near Ware, the lineal descendant of the English College at Douay, and at that time the principal ecclesiastical seminary in the south of England. Father Whitty's connection with the College paved the way to an arrangement, and ultimately, with the consent of Bishop Griffiths, the Vicar Apostolic of the London District, and Dr. Cox, the President of the College, Mr. Ward laid out a legacy of a few hundred pounds in building a small house—which developed later into a good-sized country-house—within the park in which St. Edmund's College is situated. Pugin was the architect, and it was built in the Gothic style, so far as this was consistent with Mr. Ward's resolute insistence on windows of large number and goodly size, as avenues for light and fresh air.

At Old Hall Mr. Ward was able to enjoy to the full the Catholic liturgy, which was carried out in great perfection in the College chapel. His friend Oakeley went to the College itself to prepare himself for priest's orders, and they were able to contrast the rest and peace of their new position with the constant storms which they had encountered—and, no doubt, to a great extent raised—at Oxford. Father Whitty was a frequent and beloved companion to the men whom he had so much helped in their movement towards the Church. Oakeley said to him a year or two after his conversion: "The way in which the Catholic Church has assimilated us converts is by itself a proof of her divinity. Consider what a Church must be which could tame and keep in order two men like Ward and myself! Further proof is needless." Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, was very gloomy at the secessions and the collapse of the Movement. Mr. Ward used to relate with great delight how Pusey woefully remarked, "It is very sad. And all who have left us have deteriorated so much—all, that is, with two exceptions. One exception is Newman, whose nature is so beautiful, so perfect, that nothing, not even going over to Rome, could change him. The other exception is Ward. Ward had got so bad already that with him further deterioration was impossible."

Mr. Ward in the years which followed resumed his intercourse with many old Oxford friends who, in the intense ex-

citement of public feeling, had been estranged from him during his last years of Anglican life. Bitter feelings gave place, when the strife was over, to genial recollections of earlier days. Dr. Goulbourn, the present Dean of Norwich, was one of those who thus renewed an old intimacy. The ice was broken by a characteristic passage at arms, and a hearty laugh on both sides, which did more than long explanations could have done to restore good fellowship. Goulbourn wrote proposing a meeting, and naturally assuming that Mr. Ward's Anglican orders remained valid—on the principle once a priest always a priest—addressed his letter "The Rev. W. G. Ward." Ward's reply was as follows: "MY DEAR GOULBOURN—I observe that your letter is addressed to the Rev. W. G. Ward. I believe that the usual rule of courtesy is that you should address a man, not by some title which you think he ought to assume, but by the title which he himself claims. Acting on this principle, I have addressed you as the Rev. E. M. Goulbourn. If, however, you consider that you should address me by the title which you think I ought by rights to claim, by all means let us both act on this principle. You will then be perfectly justified in addressing me as the Rev. W. G. Ward. I, on the other hand, shall be obliged to address you as E. M. Goulbourn, Esq." [1]

At this point—of great poverty in external circumstances, but of ample compensation in all those deepest joys of faith and domestic love which were all in all to him, we must leave Mr. Ward for the present. The slight proceeds of literary and teaching work, and his wife's small fortune, were all he had to look to; and though he was heir presumptive to a large property, his uncle was not an old man; he might not improbably marry, and so the nephew's chances of a larger share in this world's goods were very vague and uncertain. Mr. Ward had counted the cost, however, and when fortune came he cared not to avail himself of his position as a large landlord, or of the ordinary avenues for ambition which wealth gives. Years later, when he had been compelled to take a somewhat more active share in the responsibilities and the natural amenities of his position, he looked back to the days of obscurity, when he

[1] I write down this letter from memory. The Dean of Norwich confirms my recollection of its substance.

taught theology to the students at Old Hall, as the happiest time of his life—far happier than the days of his prominence and influence at Oxford, and far happier than the time of comparative publicity which followed his resignation of the Professor's chair. Of this time he wrote to Cardinal Wiseman as follows:—"To you I am indebted for seven years far happier than any which I ever before spent, and far happier than any others are ever likely to be on this side the grave. To you I owe it that during those years I have been rescued from the dull and wearisome routine of secular life in the world, and allowed to bear a part, however indirect, in one of the very noblest works which can possibly occupy the intellect or engage the affections,—the training of ecclesiastical students for the fulfilment of their high vocation."

With the thought of this time, and of words so characteristic of the one idea which filled his life, I may bring to a close this study of the early career of William George Ward.

## CHAPTER XV

### THE OXFORD SCHOOL AND MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

I HAVE now to endeavour to point out some of the bearings of the Oxford Movement on religious thought in England. And I wish at starting to insist on a fact—to which Mr. Ward's share in the Movement calls special attention—that it embodied, in however rough and untechnical a form, great philosophical principles, in addition to its ecclesiastical and theological tendencies. The history of the High Church party, its position in the Established Church, the bearing on its theory of Anglicanism of recent ecclesiastical legislation, the results in the Catholic Church of the conversion of Newman and his followers, the logic of facts as to the respective claims of the Churches which the history of Tractarianism has worked out, —such questions are doubtless those most obviously connected with the results of the Movement; but they are not all, nor are they the most important. The philosophical basis of Tract 85 is more important than the theological subtleties of Tract 90. Newman's treatment of the Rule of Faith touches the springs of religious thought, while his reconciliation in Tract 90 of the Thirty-nine Articles with Catholic tradition, however ingenious and serviceable, and however forcibly it appealed at the time to Englishmen as a practical contribution to the polemic of the day, was comparatively ephemeral. It touched a state of things and a condition of public opinion now universally acknowledged to have been marked by the utmost prejudice and ignorance. It dealt with infinite tact and ingenuity with an artificial view of the Anglican Church which has now crumbled away, or is fast crumbling beneath the continued and unanswerable criticism of generations.

Very few persons now claim for the Articles the unquestioning reverence fashionable in 1841. Most educated men would be ashamed of exhibiting a tithe of the ignorance displayed by the Hebdomadal Board as to the history of the English Reformation. What Newman only ventured to say with circumlocutions and precautions which brought on him the charge of downright dishonesty, is now openly assumed by Churchmen without provoking comment. Tract 90 moved the whole of England, and Tract 85 passed absolutely unnoticed; and yet, while Tract 90, for the Churchman of 1889, is entirely obsolete and slays the slain, the principles of Tract 85, its suggestions as to the nature of Faith, as to the kind of evidence admissible for a Revelation, and the nature and details of revealed truth itself, are ever being, consciously or unconsciously, made use of in varying and newly-adapted forms in the Agnostic controversies of the present day.

The instance I have chosen is but a sample. Newman's writing throughout falls into two distinct divisions, corresponding to two classes of the results of the Movement. His writings for the occasion, and dealing with the practical and immediate issues of contemporary theological controversy, culminated in the lectures on the results of the Oxford Movement, preached a few years after his reception into the Catholic Church. Events have advanced since then, and, as I shall presently point out, the lectures do not entirely correspond to the changed condition of the Anglican Church. On the other hand, the theory of Faith which slowly shaped itself in the Tracts and Parochial Sermons, which was more exclusively developed in the Oxford University Sermons, and which was yet further amplified and elaborated in the *Grammar of Assent* (published in 1870), lives and will ever live as a permanent contribution to the philosophy of religious belief.

A similar distinction holds in Ward's writings, and in his case the contrast is yet more important. His attitude in the controversies of the time differed, as we have seen, from Newman's. The skilful tact with which the latter directed minds, allowed for ignorance and prejudice, wrote as much as would be acceptable, touched on the persuasive side of new or startling truths, was wanting in Mr. Ward. And in the existing

state of things such qualifications were essential to the successful prosecution of the Anglican theory of the Movement. Mr. Ward was for ever stating general principles and extreme consequences, when the requirements of the case called rather for the veiling of one or other. Consequently his writings on the affairs of the day soon gained the character—from men who had English common sense and English love of the concrete and innocence of logic and abstract principles—of being *outré* and extravagant. But his contributions to the philosophy of the Catholic Movement incurred no such charge. They contained—both in the *Ideal* and in the long essay on "Mill" in the *British Critic*—the germs of that philosophical defence of the intuitional theory of morality, and of the import, functions, and nature of conscience, of the characteristics of necessary truth and its bearing on Theism, which later on received such ample recognition on all hands, and which Mill himself declared was not likely to be surpassed by "any future champion"[1] of the intuitional metaphysics.

I am led thus expressly to call attention to the principles and ideas which the Oxford Movement impressed upon English thought, partly by the fact that this aspect of it has been resolutely ignored by members of the Liberal school. They have treated it as exclusively a Movement in the direction of "sectarianism" in the objectionable sense of the word. They have insisted on certain distinctive developments of the principles of the Movement, rather than on those principles themselves. The conceptions, for example, of conscience as the echo of God's voice, of the Church as the exponent of conscience and of the Christian revelation, are fundamental to the scheme proposed by Newman and Ward. Details of dogma, the priesthood, the sacramental system, apostolical succession, are only duly understood as resting on this basis. External rites are prescribed and outward forms are deemed to be channels of grace, because the Spirit of God speaking through His chosen Oracle has so decreed. Their rejection means the rejection of the great conception of the visible Church on which they rest. What would be trivial in itself becomes sacred by the appoint-

[1] "I believe that in answering [Dr. Ward's arguments] I am answering the best that is likely to be said by any future champion" (*Mill on Hamilton*, fourth edition, p. 337).

ment of God—as meaningless signs on paper are allowed, by consent among men, to represent words, and to convey their deepest thoughts. The Liberals have, in their account of the matter, divorced these two elements, and have consequently been able to make light of a Movement of which they ignore the essence.

We have already seen this in the case of Dr. Arnold. "A dress, a ritual, a name, a ceremony," "objects so pitiful that if gained ever so completely they would make no man the wiser or the better,"—such are the terms which adequately describe his conception of its work. In our own day, Dean Stanley has propagated the same idea. "It is curious," he writes, "to look back upon the trivial elements which produced so much excitement. . . . The apostolical succession, the revival of obsolete rubrics, together with one or two Patristic tendencies, such as the doctrine of reserve and of mysticism, were the staple of their teaching." [1] So, too, Mr. Mark Pattison views the Movement as exclusively sectarian. He considers that Newman's "great gifts were expended" on a very "narrow basis of philosophical culture"—that he "assumed and adorned the narrow basis on which Laud had stood 200 years before. All the grand development of human reason . . . was a sealed book to him." Yet "there lay a unity, a unity of all thought, which far transcended the mere mechanical association of the unthinking members of the Catholic Church; a great spiritual unity by the side of which all sects and denominations shrink into vanity." [2] Professor's Jowett's estimate of Tractarianism, given in the Appendix to this volume, is somewhat similar in its tone. In each case there is a resolute attempt to charge the Tractarian teaching with narrowness and formalism, and with a bigotry which refused to see any truth or merit in lines of human thought which did not in fact issue in conclusions identical with its own.

Far different is Mr. Ward's account of his own aims. He speaks in the *British Critic* expressly of the "real though invisible unity existing between all truly religious men," whatever their external creed may be; and he characterises the attempt to make them understand the nature of this bond of union as "the one intellectual effort of all the most important

[1] *Edinburgh Review*, April 1881, p. 311. [2] Pattison's *Memoirs*, p. 210.

at the present time."[1] That this breadth of sympathy, and a corresponding influence over and above its immediate effects on the state of ecclesiastical parties, did in truth attach to one aspect of the Oxford Movement, I shall endeavour presently to show.

One further point must be explained at starting—in reference again to the criticisms of the Liberal school. All three of the writers already referred to allude to the unacquaintance on the part of Newman with German writers,—critical or philosophical,—and argue hence in disparagement of the intellectual elements which the Movement involved. In commenting on this strange confusion between scholarship and erudition on the one hand, and vital and deep philosophical thought on the other, it must be allowed that, viewed in the light of a *complete* scheme of religious philosophy, the failure of the school to keep pace with modern Biblical criticism and German philosophical literature was a defect; but it was a defect almost inseparable from the nature of the Movement. The Oxford school did not inaugurate merely an intellectual school of thought. They started what was in some sense a *popular* movement, and had necessarily to insist on general principles, without the qualifications in their exposition which an exact philosopher would have given. Broad and unqualified statements, then, were required in order to make them intelligible and effective for the mass of minds.

The Movement was, in this point of view, a reaction against an exaggeration of the importance of modern Biblical criticism. The Liberal school treated it as all-important. It was their watchword and warcry. The Tractarians raised an opposite standard. They maintained that criticism was ever changing, that true religious philosophy was permanent. They insisted, perhaps disproportionately and too unreservedly, on the permanent elements. But such defects are inseparable from any popular school of thought. Radicalism canonises reform, Conservatism canonises the sacredness of established order, and those fine and minute concessions which the philosophers on each side must make to the other, do not form a part of the bold outline of its programme in either case. This does not touch the intellectual depth of the Movement. Kant's

[1] *British Critic*, No. LXV., p. 206.

*Critique of Practical Reason* gives deep religious truths, though it does not approach the sphere of Biblical criticism, and Newman's teaching may well do the same; and it is curious that Dean Stanley, in the course of his disparaging remarks on Newman's depth of intellect, never once alludes to the University Sermons, in which the philosophy of his Oxford teaching was concentrated.

It is an interesting comment on the criticisms of Mr. Pattison and Dean Stanley alike—so far as they refer to the want among the Tractarian thinkers of detailed acquaintance with German metaphysicians—to note that the one really deep philosophical *thinker*—as distinguished from mere students of philosophical systems—to whom Oxford has given birth since the modern growth of German studies, was himself not a wide or constant reader. We find the following passage in the Life of Thomas Hill Green:—"Though he was constantly reproaching himself with his ignorance of philosophical literature, he never overcame his native repugnance to wide reading. He liked, as he used to say, to 'browse' amongst books; and it was by brooding over the great sayings of philosophers, rather than by traversing their systems in detail, that he seemed to get most of his intellectual nourishment. His mind was reflective, not accumulative. He always seemed to be strengthening his hold upon certain fundamental truths, and this tenacity arose, not from prejudice or the force of habit, but from a growing sense of their reasonableness. Probably no amount of extraneous reading would have materially affected his ultimate convictions."[1]

Though, however, the absence of wide German reading in no way affects the depth or soundness of the Oxford philosophers, it does, of course, limit the claims of their system. A complete treatment of religious thought needs the services of the Biblical critic and the student of the history of philosophy, as well as of the philosophical thinker and the theologian. The absence of specialists in these departments, then, does limit and explain the general tendencies of the Movement, as being rather in the direction of certain living ideas keenly apprehended, and acting as living forces, than as a complete system of fundamental philosophy and apologetics. But

[1] See *Memoir of T. H. Green*, p. cxxv. Longmans.

this is only to say that it was what it called itself,—a Movement.

With these words of preface, I address myself to the task of considering, firstly, some of the effects of the Movement on contemporary controversy between the Churches; and, secondly, the part it has taken, directly and indirectly, in the larger play of religious thought in England, and in the battle against modern unbelief. And in speaking of the latter results as the more important, I am only on a much smaller scale doing what those do who prefer to estimate the effects of Christ's teaching by the new ideas and powers which He spread over the whole world, by their ultimate and far-reaching results on Jew and Gentile, than by the actual condition of the Christian body in the year 100 A.D.

With regard to the first question—the bearing of the history of the Movement on the contest between the Churches—it has been treated so exhaustively by Cardinal Newman in his *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties*, that I shall not dwell upon it at length. The history of Anglican doctrine, from the Gorham case to the Public Worship Regulation Act, has been one long assertion of the principle for which Arnold contended, and a denial of the principle which Newman maintained. It is Parliament and the Privy Council which ultimately determine what doctrines and practices are admissible within the Established Church, whether they do so directly or by delegating their work to specialists. Bishops who, as Bishop Philpotts did, have attempted to assert their prerogative as exponents of Anglicanism have been overruled. The Erastianism which it was the object of the Movement to overthrow has, beyond question, come forth triumphant.

Let this be remembered for what it is worth; and I do not think that it has been denied even by those who regret it. There are many, however, who take up another ground. High Churchmen at the present day, while deploring the degree in which the doctrine suffered to be taught by English clergymen is determined by the State, maintain, nevertheless, that the cause of the Movement has advanced sufficiently to enable them to maintain their position. They deny Newman's contention that the Anglican Church after 1845 reasserted unmistakably that Protestant character which was congenial to

it. They point to the numerous and ever-increasing party which holds all Catholic doctrine—the Mass, purgatory, the Real Presence, not in the vague sense of Keble's early lines, but in the definite sense of the later modification of them, which allows of the Divine Presence in the host while it yet remains in the priest's hands. If Newman had only waited, they maintain, he would have found the persecution of his party to be only a temporary phenomenon. It is now tolerated so completely, and has gained so acknowledged and firm a footing in the Establishment, that High Churchmen may well take heart. If Newman had seen what we see he would never, they say, have left the Anglican Church.

This view, however plausible at first sight, seems to me to fall absolutely on a somewhat closer consideration of Newman's principles on the one hand, and of the causes of the later High Church revival on the other.

We have already seen that Newman's view concerned the Anglican Church as a Church. It was not the advocacy of certain doctrines as matters of private judgment, but as taught by the Church. It was a principle of authority. The Anglican Prayer-book and the recognised Anglican divines represented the teaching of the English Church by a tradition which had been handed down through the early Fathers of the Church from the Apostles. The bishops of the English Church were the normal witnesses to this teaching; the control of the State over doctrine, devotional *formulæ*, and ritual was an invasion —it was not akin to the genuine spirit of Anglicanism.

In all this we see two leading ideas of the rightful nature and work of the Anglican Church—opposition to Erastianism, and the authoritative insistence on certain definite doctrines as essential. And the modern High Church revival seems to me to result not from the triumph of, but from the absolute defeat of, both these conceptions. Of the first I have already spoken. Newman's attempts to rescue Anglican doctrine from the hands of the State have resulted in one continual reassertion of might against asserted right. Bishop Philpotts tries to act on Newman's principle in the Gorham case by attempting to disallow heretical views in a clergyman. The State overrules him, and such views are declared admissible in the Established Church. Hampden was branded as a heretic by the

Newmanites; the State makes him a bishop. The old Ecclesiastical Courts could claim in some sense to represent spiritual authority and Church tradition, as declared by the bishops; the State makes brand-new courts, and cuts the line of succession, which, though imaginary in its effects, was yet the assertion of a principle. Further, amid these reassertions of Dr. Arnold's conception of the Church as the servant of the State, comes the withdrawal of all religious tests in Parliament itself, and a consequent extension of the liberal principle from which Arnold himself would have shrunk with horror. Fifty years ago Arnold wrote: "The whole constitution of our Church will be utterly confounded if Jews or any other avowed unbelievers in Christ are admitted into the legislature. For then Parliament cannot be the legislature of the Church, not being an assembly of Christians; and as there is no other Church legislature to be found under our actual constitution, the government of the Church will be *de jure* extinct, and its members will have to form a new one for themselves." In the event the tie between the Church and the civil legislature has proved stronger than Dr. Arnold supposed. It has proved easier for the Anglican Church to accept a non-Christian tribunal as the ultimate court of appeal in matters of doctrine, than to accept Newman's conception of its spiritual independence, and shake itself free from State control. So much for the defeat of the first of Newman's principles.

And the defeat of his second principle is closely connected therewith. If the only authority finally binding in matters of doctrine is a secular tribunal in which Christianity itself is not an universally dominant belief, it becomes practically impossible—as we see it has actually proved to be—to give doctrinal matters the importance which Newman claimed for them. It is true that there is a considerable party which *holds* the doctrines in question, but the history of the Movement, and subsequent history, has entirely prevented them from being held as *the teaching* of the Anglican Church. The new party and the Newmanites agree only in the accidental manner in which a Jew and a French Catholic may agree to go to the play on Sunday. The one does it because he thinks Sunday a common day, the other because he thinks it a special holiday. So the Newmanite held the doctrine in question as

being *the teaching* of the Church of England, and viewed those who thought otherwise as heretics; while the very plea of modern High Churchmen is the comprehensiveness of the English Church, which tolerates them on the same principle on which it practically tolerates Socinianism. Newman's hope was to restore the Catholic ideal by degrees, to expel heresy, to reinstate once more the spiritual brotherhood of Anglicans by uniform doctrine. The attempt was made, and it signally failed. It would take a very enthusiastic hoper to look for its success now. The bond among Anglicans is becoming purely external. Persons holding the views of the Bishop of Lincoln claim to belong to a Church which tolerates the almost positivism of Canon Freemantle. Believers in a sacramental system have not only to endure direct opposition to what they hold most sacred on the part of their accredited pastors, but have to accept bishops who do not believe in the priesthood, and concurrently to recognise that those invisible bonds, whereby the framework of the Church is knit together,—orders and sacraments, which in the Catholic view *depend* on the intention of the administrators and the accurate performance of certain external rites,—may fail to exist where belief is such as to afford no security that the conditions will be carefully complied with. All this might be endured for a time as long as the hope remained that it was only temporary, and that the Established Church would ultimately be restored to unity of doctrine; but what is to be said when High Churchmen accept as ultimate a state of things in which external ordinances, sacraments, and offices are in the hands of those who are not in their view true Anglicans at all? If Anglicans and the members of the Established Church are separate bodies, and are recognised as such, Newman's view of an English Churchman, whose bishop is normally his pope, and of the Established Church as potentially Anglican, has fallen.

The great spread, then, of Catholic practices and certain Catholic doctrines has taken place at the cost of the loss of the dogmatic principle, and of the essential features of a sacramental Church. Never could one-tenth part of the views of the present High Church party have been tolerated on the ground that the English Church teaches them, and that dogma is, in its view, a sacred and important thing. A ruling power

whose spirit is that of indifferentism declares all dogma to be unimportant, and High Churchmen may hold what they like, not in virtue of any special approval on the part of the Established Church, but because that Church does not either enforce or condemn *any* doctrinal system. There has, indeed, been a triumph on the part of some of the persecuted minority of that memorable 13th of February 1845, but it is not Pusey and Keble who have triumphed; it is rather Stanley and Jowett.

I now come to the question—What is the bearing of the history of the Oxford Movement upon those great problems concerning religious knowledge and religious truth which agitate the world of English thought at the present day? Mr. J. A. Froude, in his fascinating recollections of the Oxford Movement, speaks of the scepticism which is fast leavening all classes of English society, and maintains that its leading principles were first brought before the English popular mind by Newman himself. He says, "But for the Oxford Movement scepticism might have continued a harmless speculation of a few philosophers." I make a claim for the Movement, equally important but opposite. It did not, I maintain, sow the seeds of scepticism; it saw that they were already sown. Its philosophy did not create, it only recognised frankly the new difficulties. Its object—so far as it disseminated sceptical views—was not that of the poison which seeks to destroy life, but of the inoculation which gives disease under such favourable conditions that death is averted. Briefly put, the claim I make for the philosophy embodied in the writings of Newman and Ward is that they in some degree anticipated and prepared for the two great assaults on Christianity which our own generation has witnessed and is witnessing. The first assault comes from modern Biblical criticism, and at first sight destroys the force of the old-fashioned Christian evidences, while it makes havoc among traditional beliefs respecting the Old Testament. The second assault is a *rechauffé* of Hume's philosophy,—reinforced by the theory of evolution. It denies that the human faculties are competent to deal at all with anything beyond the world of *phenomena;* it proposes to overthrow the old argument from design, which even a sceptic like John Mill had recognised as forcible, by doing away with final

causes; it meets the argument from conscience by an ingenious theory of an instinct, derived from the experiences of the race in process of evolution, prompting us to do that which is best for its preservation. These two lines of thought—destructive Biblical criticism and Agnosticism—are, I suppose, by common consent, the great forces which are undermining Christian belief in this land; and it is no small claim to make for the Oxford school that they in some degree foresaw them, and sketched those principles on which they are, in fact, being met by religious thinkers at the present time.

The principles to which I refer, so far as they were developed at Oxford, are to be found most fully in Newman's University Sermons. Starting avowedly on the broad lines of the *a priori* philosophy of Coleridge, and adopting Butler's conception of the nature of the moral proof available for religious belief, Newman brought the principles of these writers into the sphere of practical religious life. He applied them to the difficulties presented by all belief in the supernatural, developing and adding to them with an imaginative power and a wide realisation of their bearing to which their originators had never attained. His exposition was, however, throughout suggestive, after the manner of a poet; and he never emulated the more philosophical style of his precursors. Ward, while adopting and identifying himself with Newman's philosophical teaching as a whole, devoted his own powers rather to co-ordinating and systematising its principles, than to applying them in detail. He addressed himself to this task notably in his essay on Mill's logic. He grouped systematically the intuitions which the *a priori* philosophy presupposed, both in the intellectual and the moral order, and he insisted on the Pyrrhonism which must result from their denial. On the intellectual side he fixed chiefly on two points for crucial experiments—trust in memory, and belief in the uniformity of nature. The former was invalid, or it justified the principle of intuition; the latter was invalid, or it justified certainty in the absence of experimental proof. Both writers afterwards developed, with some modifications, their Oxford teaching,—Newman in the *Grammar of Assent* and Ward in his *Essays on Theism*. Here, however, I shall consider their teaching less in the light of a technical and exact philosophy, and rather in its

effect as a living force on the Oxford of fifty years ago; in the bold outline which impressed itself on the disciples of the Movement; and as a source from which later writers drew, though they did not all identify themselves with its Catholic development.

Let us for a moment recall the circumstances of the time. Mr. J. A. Froude has described them vividly in his fascinating *Short Studies*. It seems to have been a time of unquestioning belief and moral apathy.[1] There was, according to the judgment of competent witnesses, far more lack of zeal among the clergy than Mr. Froude allows; but the fundamental beliefs of Theism and Christianity were never questioned by the average Churchman. They were perhaps not deeply enough realised in many cases in all their consequences on life to suggest difficulties. Anyhow, the questioning spirit had not arisen, and men whose faith was unreal were content to leave the arguments of Paley and Campbell as a fancied foundation for beliefs which rested only on unquestioned tradition; while the more earnest had yet to learn the true analysis of their religious convictions. The Bible, likewise, was accepted by our grandfathers as an ultimate court of appeal, sanctioned by the authority of their parents and instructors. It was to them unquestionably the Word of God, whence they must derive the details of their creed.

I have already described the school which first disturbed this condition of religious thought in Oxford—the Noetic school of Whately, to which Ward for a time adhered. The fashion of questioning—why do we believe this or that—was raised by them. They were, as we have seen, an outgrowth of the spirit of the great French Revolution. Every belief in their hands had to be questioned, and its proof put to the most searching tests. If it failed to satisfy their tests it was to be discarded. Tradition, if it did not rapidly collect and express its elements, and recover and produce its title-deeds,—nay, if it could not bring proof to bear that the very title-deeds themselves were not forged,—was set aside as worth nought. All opinions started on a footing of equality, just as all men were naturally equal. The immediate victory of the strongest argument was decisive; the unexplained and unsorted mass of

[1] See Froude's *Short Studies*, vol. iv. p. 238.

past arguments and proofs were taken as worth nothing. Ancestral achievement was dismissed, as an intellectual claim for consideration, just as it had been dismissed as a political and social claim, and the victory was with the strong.

This spirit was let loose on the English society of sixty years ago. Among religious men it was not allowed the absolute free scope and unreserved application given to it by Mill and Bentham, but still even among the Noetics, Whately, Milman, and Arnold, no clear principles were insisted on limiting its action. Historical and biblical critics were called to their aid. General culture and the habit of studying all schools of thought formed an integral portion of their gospel. Philosophers of every age, opinion, and country were welcomed as affording wider knowledge and giving broader sympathies.

Such, I say, was the gospel they preached at a time when Oxford had little knowledge of German critics and German philosophers; and undoubtedly this gospel—in spite of its baneful results on the deeper philosophy of religious thought —eventually bore fruit in the wider learning and improved scholarship of the Oxford of Jowett and Pattison.

Newman, from the wonderful insight into the tendencies of a principle which never deserted him, and Ward from personal experience of the results of the questioning habit, saw whither the liberal school was going. The most dangerous questions they raised referred especially to two subjects, the method of interpreting the Bible and the order and value of the evidences for Christianity and Theism; and these Oxford writers saw that once these questions had genuinely kindled the mind of their generation, once they had been vividly realised in their consequences on the vital beliefs of religion, they would refuse to be set aside until Christianity had paid its last farthing in answer to them. The interpretation of Scripture led back to the inspiration of Scripture; this provoked historical criticism; this in turn led to questions as to the dates of the Biblical documents; what had been deemed contemporary evidence would be impugned as really a later growth; the study of other religions would suggest an analogy between the legends and miracles of Buddhism and Brahminism and those of Christianity; eastern myths of obviously human origin would appear to be contained in what had been supposed

to be the very word of God; the excited imagination would have a new and wholly human view of Christianity opened upon it, and the shock of finding what had been deemed irrefragable to be filled with difficulty,—a mine of debatable questions; of finding the force of Paley's alternative destroyed, and the possibility suggested that the facts and miracles of Christianity were established neither by fraud nor by satisfactory evidence, but by those human forces which have so often originated a legend or myth;—the shock, I say, which all this was calculated to give under such circumstances might destroy faith far and wide.

So too with the evidences for Theism. Though Christianity is in one sense absolutely dependent on Theism, still the manifestations of God in revelation and in the history of the Jews is, in fact, intimately connected in many minds with their assurance of the first great truth of natural religion. The questioning tendency, while it unnerved Christian belief and impugned the accuracy of the Old Testament history, would urge its victims, in their doubt and discouragement, to look narrowly at the details of current natural theology. The metaphysical conception of causation would be questioned as being beyond the human ken; the argument from design would seem to prove a limit either in the power or in the goodness of the Creator;—in a word, the whole of religious truth would have its foundations unsettled, and to many would appear at best an open question.

What was to stem this dangerous current or to lessen its disastrous effects? Newman saw that there were two forces at work in the questioning spirit—the imagination and the reason; and in opposition he used weapons which appealed to both. The shock of novelty which would be a part of the force of such thoughts, if they came for the first time as the instruments of a destructive philosophy, would be diminished if Newman first recognised and suggested them to his disciples as the world's view of Christianity, and as a plausible view; while at the same time he put before them a deeper and truer analysis than that to which they had been accustomed, of the foundations of Theism and proofs of revelation,—a view which was not touched by adverse arguments where these were sound, and which was independent of them where they were, if not sound, at least sufficiently plausible to confuse the mind and weaken some of

the accustomed supports of belief. Such a method as this is apparent, especially in his sermons on Faith and Reason. In some sense he went ahead of the Liberals, and raised at once many of the great issues of the modern Agnostic controversy.

The two great principles which the Oxford philosophers insisted on—in stemming the sceptical current—were the necessarily changeable aspect of all science, and of historical science inclusively, on the one hand, and on the other the existence of a permanent basis in truly religious men for Theism and Christianity, outside and beyond those traditional arguments which would be thrown into confusion or destroyed in their single-handed effectiveness by modern criticism.

The first of these principles will perhaps be brought into relief most clearly by considering the case which foreshadowed the modern conflict between science and revelation more than two centuries ago—the Galileo case. We have, roughly speaking, three distinct stages in the scientific view of the relative functions of earth and sun. First, there was the simple testimony of our senses, accepted by philosopher as well as peasant, that the sun went round the earth. The working hypothesis of plane astronomy was accepted as a literal fact by the astronomer of the eleventh century, and the simple statements of Scripture seemed likewise in harmony with this view.

Then came the first elements of the new view which Newton later on fully accounted for and explained. In the time of Copernicus and in the time of Galileo it had scarcely got further than the conception of the reversal of the relative action of earth and sun. The earth went round the sun, and not the sun round the earth. The sun was the abiding centre, and the earth was one of several planets which revolved their prescribed course around it.

Last of all came the realisation of the principle of gravitation, with all its consequences; of the fact that the sun is no more stationary than the earth had been supposed to be; that the whole solar system, of which the earth was so small a part, was but one of a myriad other similar systems; that if the sun was spoken of as stationary it was only relatively to one particular course of the earth's motion; that both sun and earth were moving rapidly in company, and in obedience to the common attraction of other distant systems.

Here, then, is a specimen of the changeable character of scientific statements—changeable not from any avoidable weakness, and not as being faulty in themselves, but as expressing different stages necessary to be gone through on the road *towards* truth, and yet none of them being final or exact expressions of truth. "Novelty is often error," says Newman, speaking of this very matter, "to those who are unprepared for it, from the refraction with which it enters into their conceptions;" and a part of this refraction consists in viewing such statements, which are relative and incomplete, as absolute and final. One who, having at first identified his faith with the literal interpretation of the language of Scripture in the matter, afterwards accepted absolutely the Copernican theory as it existed in Gallileo's time, might have his trust in Scripture shaken in a way which later scientific discovery would show to have been unwarranted. His *primâ facie* view is that there are two alternatives, as absolutely true statements—that the earth stands and the sun goes round it, or that the sun stands and the earth goes round it. Science has established, he thinks, the second, and Scripture in implying the first was wrong. But when such a man gradually understands the further developments of scientific inquiry on the subject,—when he realises by degrees how far from absolute truth is his second alternative, how complex in reality are the motions of both sun and earth, —he comes to see that an absolute and final statement was impossible for the writer of Holy Scripture, and that a statement relatively true was all that could be looked for; and that the statement conveying his meaning in language intelligible at the time was in every respect the best and most desirable.

Newman, in his memorable Oxford sermon on "developments," carries the principle of the "relativity" of scientific statements still further. He urges that the metaphysical conception of what motion is has to be determined before we can reach absolute truth on such a subject. "Scripture," Newman writes, "says that the sun moves and the earth is stationary; and science that the earth moves and the sun is comparatively at rest. How can we determine which of these opposite statements is the very truth till we know what motion is? If our idea of motion be but an accidental result of our present senses, neither proposition is true, and both are true; neither

true philosophically, both true for certain practical purposes in the system in which they are respectively found; and physical science will have no better meaning when it says that the earth moves, than plane astronomy when it says that the earth is still."

Here we have the most extreme statement of the principle that scientific statements are at a given stage relative and incomplete. And the practical application given to this principle by the Oxford teachers was the lesson of patience and trust in the face of the apparent injury done to traditional beliefs, or traditional arguments for belief. The statements of science are not final; the analysis of belief is often not final. The belief that Scripture does not err, and the belief that science leads to truth, should stand both unshaken; and yet the sense in which Scripture is in a given case to be understood,—the nature and extent of the truth which a given passage is intended by God to reveal—and the full analysis of the fact which science is discovering, may be necessary before their harmony is apparent. And these factors are often incapable of attainment for a long time, and sometimes wholly incapable under our present conditions. But this being so, it is obviously, in many cases, short-sighted and unphilosophical to reject accustomed beliefs and accustomed proofs of religious truth, on the sole ground that science at a given stage appears to discredit them. Just as the sense that the scientific method is leading to truth should be infinitely deeper than the acquiescence at a given stage in scientific statements as final, so should the sense that religion and its proofs are trustworthy in essence be infinitely deeper than the trust placed in the accuracy and finality of the form in which they are in certain cases stated. As science advances, and the verbal analysis of religious ideas becomes more exact, apparent discrepancies disappear; but in the meantime religious belief is not to be given up, but to be more deeply contemplated, with a view to distinguishing its essence from its accidental form.

There have not been wanting practical illustrations in recent times of the wisdom of this counsel. Dr. Wace and other writers have recently reminded us that the scare caused to orthodox believers by the writings of Baur and Volkmar, the fear that the old idea of contemporary evidence on which Paley

depended was disproved, and that the "myth" theory of the miraculous foundation of Christianity was incontestably established, has now been allowed even by sceptics to have been very much exaggerated. Critical science, with its constant momentary dogmatism, entered on another course. The Tübingen school has been discredited. It doubtless did good work, and was a valuable factor in the progress of critical science, but its *conclusions* are now rejected. Large portions of the synoptic gospels are now allowed, even by sceptical critics, to have been the work of eyewitnesses of the events described, or of friends of eyewitnesses. So, again, evolution was supposed to have overthrown the old design argument. But a little patience and thought has shown the case to be otherwise. The present Bishop of London, and Dr. Fisher in his *Grounds of Theistic Belief*, have stated that argument with greater force from the evolution standpoint than Paley ever did in its old form a hundred years ago. With good reason, then, did the Oxford school warn us against an over-hasty abandonment of positions identified with our accustomed religious life, against yielding to the intemperate misinterpreters of the decisions of science, or, in Newman's words, "violently handling the text of Scripture, misinterpreting it, or superseding it on a hypothesis which we took to be true, but which turns out to be untenable."

However, the other term of the argument has to be borne in mind. Science does bring about a change in the analysis of belief, and *may* discredit particular arguments which have depended on a false analysis. The passage from Josue, though its earlier interpretation had not received the blow it was first taken to have received, is certainly explained differently now that Copernicanism is established. Advancing criticism is undoubtedly modifying much of the traditional interpretation of Scripture. This is natural and inevitable. It would be strange to suppose that great research, further analysis, further raising of questions, should not in some degree affect explicit statements of knowledge on any subject. The Oxford philosophy recognised this too, and it brought out another aspect of the controversy. The arguments, moreover, of natural theology and of current Christian evidences, from the very fact that they were explicit, did in their existing form represent a given stage in the analysis of belief, just as scientific

statements represented a given stage in the progress of science. Advancing criticism and the fuller grasp of religious truth and its basis might, in a given case, weaken their force. Paley's arguments *might* be weakened; Campbell's arguments *might* prove less cogent than our forefathers had been taught. What then was to be the antidote for those whose imagination was oppressed and whose reason was confused by criticisms which might indeed prove unsound, but which *might prove sound.*

Plainly religion must have some more permanent support than this ever-changing meteor-like natural and evidential theology could supply. Something fuller, more permanent, more sustaining, less vulnerable, was needed, both to give the believer patience while critical questions righted themselves, and to support him when criticism actually broke down some of the supports to which he had been accustomed. The Oxford philosophers addressed themselves to the task of pointing out this "something." Their task was in some respects complicated—as I have already said—by the popular nature of the Movement. A complete, finely-drawn, religious philosophy would, by its very delicacy of structure, by those constant reservations and qualifications which are indispensable to most philosophical statements, have proved inadequate to the work. It would not have seized the imagination of young Oxford, or have stemmed the torrent of Liberal enthusiasm. On the other hand, the Liberal movement too—the reflection as it was of the general spirit spread by the radical philosophers, the Mills, Bentham, and the *London* and *Westminster* reviewers—had in it a great deal that was drawn on broad lines, and without philosophical accuracy; and so far it could be opposed by a broad statement of the truths it ignored.

The Liberals urged the truth that tradition often contained much that was mythical; the Newmanites answered that it always contained something that was true. The Liberals insisted on the necessity of questioning each step of proof before you could be sure that your knowledge was accurate; the Newmanites pointed out that unless first principles are unquestioned, neither Liberals themselves nor any one else possess any knowledge whatever. The Liberals looked with suspicion on a faith which seemed primarily a matter of sentiment and emotion. Religious liberals set about proving

Christianity by a logical train of deductive reasoning. The Newmanites saw that the chain must snap, that a link would be found unsound, and that more reasons and less logic would do the work much better. The Liberals dwelt on explicit arguments; the Newmanites on the inductive proof from the history of the human heart and the history of religion—a proof felt as a body to have far greater strength than the attempts at stating it could express, much in the same way as our conviction that intercourse with our fellows reveals the existence of minds external to our own, infinitely transcends in force the reasons we can give for thinking so. The Liberals insisted on evidence from fact, *a posteriori;* on evidence available in the law courts, convincing to an impartial juror; the Oxford school pointed out that the answer of the Christian message to the need of the human heart, and its actual achievement in the moral elevation of mankind, were *a priori* proofs and presumptions in its favour, which made it reasonable for one who believed in Providence to accept Christianity on evidence which would *not* satisfy one who neglected to consider these presumptions. The more religious Liberals were not ready to probe the grounds for Theism after their accustomed method for testing the truth of a belief; the Newmanites held that this reluctance arose unconsciously from the irreligious tendency of their principles; that the necessary questions would in the end be asked by the religious as well as irreligious Liberals, and would have to be answered as the Agnostic answers them. Newman himself, moreover, forestalled the Agnostic statement that the human mind has no faculty by which it can recognise the existence of an all-holy Creator, by calling attention, with subtle power of psychological analysis, and by striking deep into the heart-springs of human nature with weapons of imagination and reason alike, to the shadow of the Divinity revealed in conscience. He insisted on the presence of God in man's heart, alike as a fact of which a religious man may be conscious in himself, and as an undeniable and startling phenomenon, and in the wonderful history of Judaism and Christianity. It was, he maintained, a phenomenon whose significance increased in proportion as it was dwelt on. It testified, by the persistency of its manifestations, by the calm conviction of those who have experienced it, and by the fruits it has brought forth, that a Reality has been forcing its way into the

human mind, and gradually revealing itself more and more clearly; and by these same tokens it gave the lie to the suggestion that a mere complication or evolution of human feelings could account for an impression so deep, so constant, so direct, of the presence and action of an all-holy Ruler and Judge.

Once more the Liberals held that when the process of probing and analysing the grounds of belief was at fault in satisfactorily establishing a doctrine, the doctrine was to be discarded; the Oxford school, on the other hand, held that the body of religious influences was in possession, and that the faculty of analysis was more likely to be partly and temporarily at fault than deep religious impressions and convictions to be groundless. Consequently, one school said, "discard if you cannot prove;" the other, "retain until it is proved you must discard."

Finally, while the Liberals waxed eloquent on the necessity in all cases of scientific proof, of testing and sifting, of eliminating that mass of emotion, tradition, predisposition, which is responsible for the thousand prejudices we see around us, the Newmanites pointed out that there might nevertheless be practical certainty without scientific analysis. Prejudice as a frame of mind had distinctive notes, and so had certainty. Scientific analysis was not indispensable for the latter, nor was its absence an unfailing sign of the former. A man may be conscious that he is unprejudiced, and may even be conscious of knowledge in many cases, without being able fully to give his reasons. He may know enough for practical purposes long before his knowledge is scientific in form.

This in truth was the essential difference which Newman insisted on. The Liberals were treating of the science of evidence, the Oxford school of the art of religious knowledge. A carpenter has knowledge enough of the nature of wood to cut it, to plane it, to piece it together, though he may not know those principles of statics and dynamics which govern his operations. Probably if he began to regulate his movements by scientific calculations, he would be for a time less precise; his scientific proofs would at first leave elements out of consideration, of which his practised hand instinctively takes account. I remember a friend of mine, a good practical workman, trying to measure a wall by trigonometry. He brought out his theodolite, measured its distance from the base of the wall, observed the angle, did his

sum, and made out that the wall was four miles high. If he had measured it in the ordinary way he would certainly have been more exact. Yet the trigonometrical proof, when accurately done, was absolutely scientific, and would save much trouble. He had made a mistake in the sum. Simple measurement was, until his science was perfected, a safer road, though a less scientific, to truth.

So, too, when his science has reached perfection it may give the carpenter short cuts. He may carry his loads more easily when he is thoroughly acquainted with the principles of the lever. The scientific architect will instruct him with advantage as to the distribution of weight in building. Still that practical knowledge of the nature of wood—what strain such a bit will endure, what wood will expand with damp, what will not, what is suitable for panelling, what is good enough for a common table—these commonplaces he knows without knowing the scientific reasons for them; and he rightly has no fear that science will ever make him think differently, though it may teach him more, and may enable him to express more fully and exactly what at present he only knows experimentally. But while he remains in ignorance of scientific proof—or even while he is in process of learning some of it—he abides by his present informal evidence and acts upon it.

The Oxford school applied these general principles to religion. Mankind had, they maintained, real, though not fully and scientifically expressed, evidence in the great broad facts of the history of the people of God and of the Church, such facts as no sane critic can question, and in facts learnt from their own moral experience—if they obeyed their conscience,—of the possibility of knowing God, and of the truth of Christianity. To reject the testimony of conscience in the individual and in the continuous history of holy men, and to reject the worth of the *Testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ*, because such proofs could not at once be resolved into scientific form, was unreasonable. These great facts, confirmed in their weight by the actual working of Theistic and Christian belief, were a great presumption not to be ignored, that if a perfect science of religious evidence should ever be possible, it would correspond in its results with the practical belief of Christians. These presumptions, based as they were to a great extent on the experience of

the moral nature, must pre-suppose a certain state of the heart for their full appreciation; and the temper of mind proper to the ascetic Christian was, as we have already seen, insisted on as a necessary condition to their being felt in their full weight. But given right dispositions, the Oxford teachers maintained that a religious man acted reasonably in resting on these presumptions, in preserving the spirit of faith, and remaining in a peace untouched by the constant revolutions in the detailed view of facts which scientific progress necessarily entailed. Thus was the *primâ facie* plausibleness of Agnosticism stemmed; and thus was preserved some at least of the authority of sacred instincts —once protected by traditional reverence, but now in danger of being swept aside wholesale as unreasonable sentiment.

Enough has already been cited from Mr. Ward's writings illustrative of the Oxford teaching as to the evidence for God's presence in the consciences of holy men. I may here quote, as an instance of the line of argument I have sketched, the words of one of the Oxford school who did not become a Catholic, but who has preserved and embodied in beautiful language some of the religious philosophy of the Movement. The present Dean of St. Paul's, in his stirring and powerful lectures on the Psalms, sums up the significance of that wonderful portion of the sacred Scriptures in the following passage, which deals directly with the Agnostic position:—

"I am surely not saying too much," he writes, "in asserting that nothing in kind like this, nothing in any way comparable to it, is to be found in the noblest and highest examples of any other ancient religious language. We know what there was in the world besides; where do we look for its counterpart? The Psalms stand up like a pillar of fire and light in the history of the early world. They lift us at once into an atmosphere of religious thought which is the highest that man has ever reached; they come with all the characteristic affections and emotions of humanity, everything that is deepest, tenderest, most pathetic, most inspiring, along with all the plain realities of man's condition and destiny, into the presence of the living God. I am justified in saying that in that stage of the world's history this is absolutely unique. I am now only stating it as a fact, however to be accounted for. Christians account for it from the history in which the Psalms are embedded, and by the light and guidance from above implied in that history; and what other account can be given I find it hard to imagine. That such thoughts, such words, so steady and

uniform in their central idea, so infinitely varied in their forms of expressing it, should have been produced in any of the nations which we call heathen, is to me absolutely inconceivable. That they should have been produced among the Hebrews, if the Hebrews were only as other nations, is equally inconceivable. But I want only to impress the fact, one of the most certain and eventful in the history of the world. . . .

"Are we not constantly told that the songs of a people reflect its character; that a religion, in its idea of God, reflects its worshippers? What sort of character is reflected in the Psalms? They come to us from a people like their neighbours, merciless and bloody, yet they are full of love and innocence and mercy. They come from a people whose deep sins and wrong-doing are recorded by their own writers; yet the Psalms breathe the hunger and thirst of the soul after righteousness. They come from a race still in the rude childhood of the world: yet they express the thoughts about God and duty, and about the purpose and reward of human life, which are those of the most refined, the gentlest, the most saintly, the most exalted whom the ages of the world have ever seen, down to its latest.

"The question is asked in these days, Is God knowable? The answer depends on a further question. Whether God can be known by man depends on whether we have the faculties for knowing. . . . Is there in human nature such a faculty, separate from the faculties by which we judge of the things of sense and the abstractions of the pure intellect, but yet a true and trustworthy faculty for knowing God—for knowing God, in some such way as we know the spirits and souls, half-disclosed half-concealed under the mask and garment of the flesh, among whom we have been brought up, among whom we live? Can we know Him in such a true sense as we know those whom we love and those whom we dislike; those whom we venerate and trust, and those whom we fear and shrink from? The course of the world, its history, its literature, our everyday life, presuppose such knowledge of men and character; they confirm its existence and general trustworthiness, by the infinitely varied and continuous evidence of results. The question whether there is such a faculty in the human soul for knowing its Maker and God—knowing him, though behind the veil; knowing Him, though flesh and blood can never see Him; knowing Him, though the questioning intellect loses itself in the thought of Him, —this question finds here its answer. In the Psalms is the evidence of that faculty, and that with it man has not worked in vain. The Book of Psalms is like the fact of the production, by the existence and exercise of a faculty in man's nature, of vast results, such as a great literature, a great school of painting, a great body of music. If it is not a proof and example of this power of knowing, I cannot

imagine what a proof can be. The proof that the living God can be known by man is that He can be loved and longed for with all the freedom and naturalness and hope of human affection. The answer whether God has given to man the faculty to know Him might be sought in vain in the Vedas or the Zendavesta. It is found in the Book of Psalms."

One more point on which Mr. Ward especially insisted must be noted, which again seemed to anticipate the criticisms of such writers as Mr. Huxley and Mr. Spencer.

Conscience being that faculty whereby direct religious *knowledge* became possible,—a principle which gave the lie to the fundamental statement of the Agnostics that we have no faculty for knowing God,—and the testimony of the purified heart being one of the indispensable roads to the recognition of Christian truth, it was evident that Christianity must exhibit itself in fact as the perfection of moral truth and of the natural law. Hence, distortions of Christian truth—Lutheranism, Calvinism, Manicheism—must be expelled with all their works. Christianity could not identify itself with what conscience condemns. It could not be at war with those very laws of morality of which it claimed to be the highest expression. If its conquest was due to its absolute sanctity, its supremacy must cease if it allied itself with immorality; and so Mr. Ward urged, in the unmeasured language I have already cited, the bearing of these heresies on the moral law, and their disastrous effects on the Christian character. The purification of external Christianity, its constant cleansing and recleansing by the religious spirit, the subservience of all its rites and doctrines to the one great good,—personal holiness,—this is the lesson we learn in every page of the *Ideal*. Here again we find, as I have said, an anticipation of and an answer to the objections of modern Agnostics. Mr. Huxley makes capital out of the excessive formalism and ritualism of the Jews. Mr. Cotter Morison insists on the unpredictable forces in the Christian spiritual life, which must lead, he says, to fatalism, and to the neglect of the struggle for personal sanctity. He accuses Christians of exclusive attention to ultimate salvation, and of disregard of daily duty on earth provided that this one object is ensured. Mr. Herbert Spencer and others dwell on the supposed immorality of many

Christian doctrines—as the Atonement, or original sin, or eternal punishment. Without supposing that these attacks were answered in detail by Mr. Ward, they were at least anticipated by him and to some extent guarded against.[1] He pointed out that there was a purifying spirit *within* the Church which was at work in ridding it of what was really open to attack on these points; that where such attacks were not based on a misconception of facts, they were attacks on human perversions of Christianity, and not on its essential teaching and spirit.

I have referred early in this chapter to the charge brought against the Oxford leaders that they were unacquainted with historical and biblical criticism, and even if the facts of the case have been somewhat overstated, there is undoubtedly some truth in the charge. The deficiency was partly due, as I have explained, to the fact that the Movement was a revolt against the exaggeration of the claims of those sciences among the Liberals Still, while this explanation is sufficient as far as it goes, and while on the whole it may have done its work the more successfully from a disproportionate insistence on neglected truths and principles, the defect in question does, no doubt, limit its claim as a philosophy of religion. Critical and historical sciences have their place in the establishment of the facts of Christianity. We could ill afford to dispense with the labours of Bishop Lightfoot or Dr. Westcott. Weiss's *Leben Jesu* in Germany has been known to do a work for religion among critical minds which Newman's somewhat mystical philosophy of faith could not do by itself. Among Catholics the place of biblical criticism has certainly been ever recognised, even if it has not of late years been pursued by as many writers of genius as other departments can boast. The fatal error of assuming that Christianity could be conclusively established without reference to those phenomena in the human soul and in the history of the chosen people, which afford a presumption for, and explanation of, the alleged facts of Christian history, must not be allowed to lead, by reaction, to the neglect of the critical side. Mere presumptions, though they may lessen the improbability of miraculous facts, nay, may in some cases give them

[1] In the Appendix I have collected several passages from the *Ideal* bearing on some of these questions.

antecedent probability, do not dispense with the necessity for *a posteriori* proof. And Newman, though allowing the force of Hume's argument against miracles to a greater extent than many would allow it, did not dwell on this particular aspect of religious philosophy. His sharp distinction between the insight of the spiritual mind and a purely rationalistic view of religious evidences—between Faith and Reason as he expressed it,—deeply as it cut, fully as it satisfied some men, had in other cases to pay the penalty of its incompleteness. This must not be left out of account in estimating the results of the Movement. Arthur Clough, J. A. Froude, Mark Pattison, here are names which at once arise of men of mark and force whose faith was weakened and destroyed instead of being fortified by the Movement.

Mr. Froude states the impression produced on him thus. Newman said, he tells us, that "historically the proofs [of Christianity] were insufficient, or sufficient only to create a sense of probability. Christianity was apprehended by a faculty essentially different. It was called faith. But what was faith, and on what did it rest? Was it as if mankind had been born with but four senses by which to form their notions of things external to them, and that a fifth—sight—was conferred on favoured individuals, which converted conjectures into certainty? I could not tell. For myself this way of putting the matter gave me no new sense at all, and only taught me to distrust my old ones."

In the writings of J. A. Froude and of the poet Arthur Clough alike, the imaginative picture of all the consequences of the alternative views of life presented by the Oxford school appears most vividly. In Clough the moral effort to strike the balance and sum up the controversy seems to have been wanting. J. A. Froude's grasp of the views in question is equally remarkable, but his interpretation of their significance is somewhat different from Clough's. In that vivid book, the *Nemesis of Faith*, we have them sketched with wonderful force and life. Let me rapidly glance at some of their chief features, and note their similarity to the ideas which possessed Mr. Ward, and yet the wide difference in the conclusions of the two men. Here is, in the first place, Froude's account of the Anglican Church of 1831—the "Our Church" of Mr. Ward's

invectives, with its "moderate" and "venerable" dignitaries and ecclesiastics:—

"A foolish Church, chattering, parrot-like, old notes, of which it had forgot the meaning; a clergy who not only thought not at all, but whose heavy ignorance, from long unreality, clung about them like a garment, and who mistook their fool's cap and bells for a crown of wisdom, and the music of the spheres; selfishness alike recognised practically as the rule of conduct, and faith in God, in man, in virtue, exchanged for faith in the belly, in fortunes, carriages, lazy sofas, and cushioned pews; Bentham politics, and Paley religion; all the thought deserving to be called thought, the flowing tide of Germany, and the philosophy of Hume and Gibbon; all the spiritual feeling, the light-froth of the Wesleyans and Evangelicals; and the only real stern life to be found anywhere, in a strong resolved and haughty democratic independence, heaving and rolling underneath the chaff-spread surface. How was it like to fare with the clergy gentlemen, and the Church turned respectable in the struggle, with enemies like these? Erastianism, pluralities, prebendal stalls, and pony-gigging parsons,—what work were they like to make against the proud, rugged, intellectual republicanism, with a fire sword between its lips, bidding cant and lies be still, and philosophy, with Niebuhr criticism for a reaping sickle, mowing down their darling story-books? High time it was to move indeed. High time for the Church warriors to look about them, to burnish up their armour, to seize what ground was yet remaining, what time to train for the battle."

Here too is Mr. Froude's account of the weapons with which the Apostles of the Movement girded themselves,—of the elements of that Catholic sanctity which they held up in contrast to the common-sense working Protestantism of England, and to the spirit of this world which practically possessed the Anglican Church. Mr. Froude realised and accentuated the contrast, so familiar in Scripture, but which Newman brought at that time actively into practical life, between the qualities which lead to worldly success on the one hand, and the unearthly sanctity of the true Christian on the other; the spirit of current Anglicanism was fast beginning to canonise the former, the Movement aimed at vindicating and establishing in its ministry the latter.

"The question with the Tract writers was, whether with the help of the old framework they could unprotestantise its working character, and reinspire it with so much of the old life as should enable it to do the same work in England which the Roman Church produced abroad;

to make England cease to produce great men—as we count greatness—and for poetry, courage, daring, enterprise, resolution, and broad honest understanding, substitute devotion, endurance, humility, self-denial, contrition, and faith. . . . Long-sighted men saw now that Chris-
r its life, and that, unless it was very soon to
ied in Germany and France, something else
h sense must be inoculated into the hearts of
ıg as we were going on, making too much of
old upon the next; forgetting, as we all did,
r real world, and this but a thorny road to
ıg feet, and broken spirits. It was high

ues :—

from its Erastianism into militancy, where
nd respect for its sincerity. . . . Slowly
out of the whirl of business to thought
ılf-assertion, from the clamouring for their
ndependence, to alms-giving, to endurance
ɔnal—from doing to praying—from early
he field, to matins and daily service; this
ıct Movement. God knows, if Christianity
enough to get fulfilled. For surely it is
the awful place the Bible says it is, the
battle-field between good and evil spirits for the eternal happiness or eternal perdition of human souls—to go out, as we all do, clergy and all of us—to eat, and drink, and labour, and enjoy our labour's fruit, and find our home and happiness here."

Such are the words of the hero of Mr. Froude's novel, Markham Sutherland, who passes for a time under the influence of the Newmanite teaching. His subsequent history is told with deep pathos. Having realised the two views of life—the natural and supernatural—vividly, and, as it seems to me, in a morbid and overstrained spirit, he breaks down. He cannot believe in the awful alternatives of Christianity. Several causes are at work in his change, but the main one is described to be the rejection of the Christian conception of sin. "If there be any such thing as sin," he wrote, "in proportion to the depth with which men feel it they will gravitate towards Rome."[1] Sutherland rejects the reality of sin. "Sin as commonly understood," he wrote, "is a chimera." He settles down into a naturalistic view of life and of human nature, and rejects the

[1] *Nemesis of Faith*, p. 160.

literal Christianity of the Gospels which the Movement had forced on his attention, with all its consequences. "For me," he writes, "the World was neither so high nor so low as the Church would have it; chequered over with its wild light shadows, I could love it and all the children of it more dearly perhaps because it was not all light. 'These many men so beautiful,' they should be neither God's children nor the Devil's children, but the children of men." It is at this point that Sutherland is spoken of as "working round to a stronger and more real grasp of life." The melancholy history which follows of his crime, of his feverish repentance and acceptance of Catholicism as an anæsthetic, of the consequent reaction and final despair, of the miserable death after which, as his biographer says, "no living being was left behind him on earth who would not mourn over the day which brought life to Markham Sutherland,"—of all this I will not speak, as Mr. Froude plainly implies that it was the result of special circumstances and of an unhinged mind.

Up to the point of which I have spoken, however, the history is obviously intended as both typical and as the history of a reasonable mind. Let it be noted, then, that the two central problems of religious life with which Mr. Froude deals—in one case in his own person, in the other in that of his hero—are closely connected, and at least bring out the coherency and force of the religious philosophy of the Oxford school. The first problem is that of historical and critical evidence. It is the problem which is now being constantly urged upon orthodox believers. A novel which has been widely read, and is undoubtedly representative of a very active school of thought, has painted graphically the decay of orthodox faith on this one ground. Robert Elsmere lost his belief simply because it seemed to him that modern criticism invalidated the testimony for the miraculous element in the Christian history. Let it be noted well then that the Oxford school saw fifty years ago that advancing science would urge this line of argument. It is fifty years since Newman proclaimed to his disciples that the historical evidence pure and simple for Christianity—isolated and viewed simply as evidence *a posteriori* for a miraculous fact—was insufficient. That proclamation, as we have here seen, saved for Ward orthodox belief, and destroyed

such belief in Froude. Whence this difference of effect? It is to be found in the second problem, the second crucial struggle which Mr. Froude describes in the person of his hero.

Let me try and explain this. Newman had maintained, as we have seen, that to those who recognise the God of Christianity, to those who trust the reality of their communion with Him in prayer, who see His hand in the outlines of the history of the chosen people, and in the unearthliness of Christian doctrine and Christian life, there arises a strong presumption for the facts of Christianity which supplies the deficiency of the historical evidence. This presumption did not indeed, even on Newman's principles, dispense with the necessity of *a posteriori* proof for a complete theory of belief; but it so transformed and deepened the grounds of belief as to require for its destruction far more cogent evidence discrediting revelation than the chameleon-like critical school had brought or was likely to bring. He maintained that new explanations or modifications here and there of the current orthodox language was the probable solution of difficulties raised by new discoveries, which hasty and intemperate intellectualists, with the sanguineness of specialists rather than the caution of philosophers, urged and would urge as fatal to belief in a miraculous Christianity. Again, the history of Christianity disclosed possibilities of a renewal of the human soul, and revealed divine forces for effecting that renewal, and those forces had in fact been absolutely bound up with belief in a miraculous history. Vivid belief in that history had been the life of the Church. The supposition (often advanced in our days) that Christianity can do its work as well without this belief, was purely speculative and unwarranted, and contrary to all analogy. Christianity without a basis in fact was like filial affection without the existence of a father or mother.[1] The life of the Christian character has been trust in facts.

This being so, if we recognise an over-ruling Providence in the history of the Church, we have in that recognition a strong presumption that the vital facts of Christianity are true. The vivid recognition of this presumption by the realisation of Christian sanctity, of the Christian

[1] See *Apologia*, p. 49.

spirit, and of the hand of Providence in the history of his Church, and of the difference in kind between the personal trust in a still living and Divine Christ and the mere devotion to an idea—both in itself and in its effects—such personal apprehensions as these help to form that spirit of Faith which Newman urged as necessary in supplementing the historical evidences; and it was this spirit which Mr. Froude declared himself unable to understand.

Here we must leave Mr. Froude himself and go to the hero of his novel, who gives us more materials for judgment. Markham Sutherland goes so far with Mr. Froude, but in his case we have the key to the effect produced on him by Newman's philosophy of Faith. Why did that philosophy lead Mr. Ward out of that sceptical frame of mind into which it plunged Markham Sutherland? The reply has only to be briefly indicated; the materials for it have been given already. To Mr. Ward the difficulties of the historical proof were already a reality. He saw the impossibility of viewing the miraculous events of the Christian history as something apart from its internal credentials—as facts to be established by the cold dry light of *a posteriori* proof. The presumptions of the case, in this view, were all *against* the truth of such a history. What was miraculous, as at least unusual, was improbable. The superficial points of resemblance between Christianity and other religions seemed the most significant points. They were at all events the most obvious and easily ascertainable points, if Christianity were approached from without instead of from within. If supposed miracles in other religious systems were mythical, so, probably, were the Christian miracles. If other mythologies were traceable to ascertainable sources of error in human nature, why should not the Christian theology be equally so traceable? Such were the presumptions, such the guiding spirit of inquiry, to one who approached the matter purely as an external event, without personal relation to himself, and affording no special or unusual internal evidence.

On the other hand, on Newman's principles Ward found the presumptions reversed. Commence by the realisation of the depths of the human soul, of its relations with God, of the probability that God would grant a revelation, of the points of

contrast between the Christian revelation and other religions, and facts assume a different colour. If Christianity in its true exhibition is *unlike* religious fanaticism, and is unique among religions, the antecedent improbability of its miracles to a great extent ceases. An event solitary in human history for its greatness and significance may well bring marvels in its train. The enquirer proceeds, then, in comparing it with other religions, to note *differences* rather than similarities. Again, the actual experiences of a practical Christian increase his perception of God's presence with mankind, and lead the Christian to add the weight of vivid belief in the Providential course of the great events in history, to those *a posteriori* proofs which, taken alone, left the matter undetermined.

Thus Newman's philosophy *added* much to Ward's Christianity, while it took away nothing. And—which is here in point—the additions depended on deeper and more explicit realisation of the spiritual nature of man in his existing condition, of his relations with God, and of the internal marks which the Christian message bears of its own divinity. And an integral element of each of these three, in our fallen state, is the conception of sin. Without that conception Theism and Christianity alike assume an entirely new character in their relations to mankind, and are only apprehended imperfectly and externally. The sense of the need of a remedial religion for fallen man, the prayer to God for help in the struggle against sinful nature, the actual consciousness of the contrast between the ideal standard which our better nature reverences and the evil inclinations and acts of the lower nature—these are elementary facts in that internal and personal view of Christianity to which Newman appealed. And they all involve the sense of sin.

Sutherland, as we have seen, denied the reality of sin altogether; and in doing so he destroyed that fabric of internal evidence for which Newman contended. The destruction, then, of the purely external proof of Christianity was to him the destruction of all proof. But it deserves consideration whether the elimination of sin from the realities of the human soul does not, in practice, leave the Theism which may remain a comparatively meaningless formula—parallel rather to Deism or even to Pantheism than to the Theism of a religious Unitarian.

For myself I confess this seems to be the case, and the grounds on which Sutherland rejected Newman's philosophy of faith seem to involve the loss of all idea of the soul's personal relations with God. I am not denying that many might reject that philosophy and yet preserve the conception of those relations untouched. Dr. Martineau, for example, would undoubtedly deny that Newman's principles give sufficient grounds for a belief in the miracles of Christianity. All I contend for is that in the history of Sutherland it is the denial of those relations—the loss of all sense of what is the first reality of spiritual consciousness in communion with the supreme power, the sense of sin,—which led to the rejection of Newman's principles. His rejection of sin led, further, to the rejection of Catholicism, not, as he professed, because the sense of sin leads directly to Catholicism as an anæsthetic, but mainly in virtue of those elements in Catholicism which it shares with all true Theism, but which it presents so much more fully and vividly, in all their consequences.

Tractarianism forced on Sutherland's attention the dilemma which a less definite and active system might have left him to recognise or not as he pleased. It was a choice between active recognition of the reality of the spiritual life and its rejection. Confession, self-examination, and the detailed religious practices of the party pressed the dilemma on his attention; and when he looked back at the principles of faith itself, he found again that Newman held up the moral proof, based on the spiritual life, as all-important. Had these elements been less forcibly insisted on, it is conceivable that there would have been no open apostacy; but none the less, if the inability to believe fully in the reality of sin was already there, Newman's teaching was rather the occasion than the cause of the avowed scepticism which ensued. A temporary withdrawal of the pressure of asceticism, and a more prominent insistence on *a posteriori* and historical Christian evidences might have calmed Sutherland's mind for a time; but such treatment would not have touched the root of his disease; and unless a more radical change had been effected by other agencies, the scepticism must have ultimately asserted itself.

An additional circumstance, which would seem to favour this view, lies in the fact that Newman's writings have often

been known to help in their struggle against unbelief those who do not recognise that their full development is to be found only in the Church. Such thinkers—to whom prayer and sin were already realities—even when they have found him in part unconvincing, have not found him sceptical in tendency. To pursue this further, however, or again to consider how far other cases—such as those of Clough and Pattison[1]—can be explained on the same lines as that of Markham Sutherland, would carry me beyond my present limits.

With these suggestions, then, I bring to a close my study of certain phases of the Oxford Movement. I have not attempted to estimate the extent or degree of its consequences. It is possible that these are hardly capable of being ascertained fully even now. I have spoken only of the direction of its influence on the points I have referred to. That its effect on religious thought must ultimately prove to have been considerable will hardly be doubted by those who attribute to the Oxford writers qualities which few have denied them—deep and single-minded earnestness and rare intellectual gifts—and who bear in mind that these qualities were kindled and concentrated in their action, by a crisis of spiritual animation without parallel in our own century and country.

---

NOTE.—I should remark, for the benefit of Catholic readers, that while I have throughout the foregoing chapter implied that all that was best and truest in the Tractarian teaching finds its natural outcome and fullest expression in the Church, and while in some instances Tractarian doctrine was identical with Catholic doctrine and is spoken of as Catholic, I have not attempted the task of examining what modifications in detail or in expression would be necessary to bring the writings of the Oxford school into complete accord with the teaching of the Catholic schools. Such a task, however interesting in itself, would have been outside the scope of my book.

# APPENDIX A

The following sermon, written by Mr. Ward in December 1837, while he was still to some extent "Arnoldian," illustrates certain features in his attitude on religious subjects described in Chapter IV. It will be noticed that he rejects the doctrine of the "real presence" in it—a doctrine which a few months later he accepted with the rest of the Anglo-Catholic theology.

*God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.*—ST. JOHN iv. 24.

*No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.*—ST. JOHN i. 18.

GOD is a Spirit, as our Lord says: now what is a Spirit? we cannot tell, the wisest of us any more than the most ignorant; only as we get wiser we see more and more that we cannot tell. All that we know is that it is not a body—not anything which may be discerned by our senses. So then we cannot have any idea of a Spirit, and so of what God is. We know that He made us, that He preserves and watches over us, that He loves us; we know again, or we may know if we will read the Bible, that our first duty of all is to love Him; that our love even of our families, our wives, our children, should be far less than our love of Him: much more our love of the business and pleasure of this world. We may know that to promote His glory should be the one chief object we have in view in all our thoughts, words, and actions. "Whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, we are to do all to the glory of God." We may know that industry, honesty, contentment, chastity, are only acceptable to God at all, so far as they arise from thoughts of Him; that in proportion as they are caused by a regard to our interest in this life, to our health, for instance, or to getting and laying by money, or to being liked by our neighbours, that in proportion say as these and the like are principal causes of our good actions, they lose their value in the sight of God altogether. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind," says our Lord. "This is the first and greatest commandment; and the second is like unto it, thou shalt

love thy neighbour as thyself."[1] Observe again in the Lord's prayer the very first petition, before we ask anything for ourselves or others, is "Hallowed be thy name": but there is no use in saying more about this; we cannot look carefully at any part of the Bible without seeing this great truth clearly expressed. And yet how hard a task it is so to love Him, so continually to keep Him in our thoughts, to be so careful and jealous of His honour, when, as we have seen, we can have no idea whatever of Him as He is. So hard a task that many, it is to be feared, at different times have been led to paint Him to themselves in the form and image of an earthly king sitting in the heavens with a crown and sceptre, and thence looking down upon and ruling the earth. But the second commandment forbade the Jews from making any graven image of Him; and the spirit of that commandment must ever remain to restrain us from daring to think of Him under any image which He has not allowed; so that if no more were to be said than we have said, it must follow that we, poor weak creatures of sense as we are, ever carried away by the things around us from bearing in mind what is out of our sight, must try, as best we might, to have a continual fear and love of Him whose very existence we must believe by faith, and could not by any allowed means bring home to our imaginations. Nay, we should be in a worse state than were the Jews, for they beheld the presence of God in the pillar of the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night; they saw His glory when it filled Solomon's temple; they saw God's presence among them by a continual succession of miracles and providential dispensations; while we have no such supports to our faith, "for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning."[2]

Of course, were it so, it would still be our true wisdom and bounden duty thankfully to accept the salvation offered to us, to try by the help of God's Holy Spirit to purify ourselves even as He is pure; and to labour ever, as in His sight, to do our duty in that state of life to which it hath pleased Him to call us. But, blessed be God, this is not all that is to be said. For what is the great event which this holy season of the year brings especially before us? No less than this, that God, the maker of all things visible and invisible, has taken upon Him our form and our nature, both soul and body; has become like unto us in all things—in hopes, feelings, desires, affections, in joy, in grief, in hunger, thirst, and weariness, in everything but this—that He did no sin; that Jesus of Nazareth, very God and very Man, was born into the world, from an infant became a child, from a child increased in wisdom and in stature, became a man; that for thirty years He lived, as any of us might live, going out and coming in, working and resting, being

[1] Matt. xxii. 37.

[2] 2 Peter iii. 4.

in subjection to His mother and His reputed father, and, as it seems, occupied with His trade of a carpenter; that after that time He preached for three years a new revelation from God, and closed at length a life of continual grief and suffering by a painful and despised death. It is surely an awful thought; well is it, as has been truly said, when we first bring it home to us, if it do not haunt us in our very dreams. Now the chief privilege which flows to us from this stupendous act of mercy is of course that by His death and resurrection He has reconciled us to God, and made us the heirs of everlasting life; that whereas ever since Adam's fall sinful man had been in a state of enmity against God, He bare our sins on His own body on the tree, that we being by nature born in wrath, might become, to use the expression of the collect for Christmas Day, which is repeated in to-day's service—God's children by adoption and grace. But this benefit being singled out from the rest for special observance at Eastertide, it may be more fitting at present to turn our thoughts to some of the many other blessings which follow in its train.

And now we have the point to which I wished to bring what I said at first: "No man hath seen God at any time," it is most true, "but the only begotten Son hath declared Him." We may then think worthily of God by thinking of Jesus Christ; we may without idolatry worship God in the form of His only begotten Son.

Now all that I have been saying about His coming to us and dwelling upon earth is probably quite familiar to us all; and so indeed it would seem, for if we heard of it for the first time, what words could express the eager anxiety with which we should press on to know all that was to be known as to the doings upon earth of this great and wonderful being! Whereas, alas! how few of us there are—I mean even among those who are in the habit of reading the Bible—who at all see how great their privilege is in being allowed to read it! how many who open it wearily as an appointed task, and are glad when they come to the end of their appointed chapter, that they may close it again! "Blessed are your eyes," says our Lord, "for they see, and your ears, for they hear; for I say unto you that many prophets and wise men have desired to see those things which ye see and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear and have not heard them." Those things which we may, any of us, read any day in the New Testament, are [those for which] holy and wise men of old would gladly have resigned all other earthly blessings if they might have known them; but they might not. We know them; and I ask, can we even for a moment conceive the state of mind which would hold that knowledge more precious than all earthly things, than all happiness, than increase of riches, than unfailing health? and if we cannot conceive it, are we not self-condemned? I said that we know

these things; but do we know them? or rather, although the words are so familiar to us, have we any of us ever heartily conceived the thing expressed by the words? have we ever fixed in our minds the great events I have run through, as things which as really and certainly happened upon this earth as anything that we see around us every day? and yet which far more nearly concern us than anything that we see around us? . . . It must very much concern us, then, to find out the cause why we so little understand what we all so fully believe; or rather, that our belief extends only to the words and not to the idea signified. Now though there are other things which partly account for this, one great cause seems certainly to be that one most important part of Scripture we do not read in such a manner as to draw from it the very chief benefit it was intended to give us: I mean the four Gospels. They contain an account of the life of our Lord chiefly from the time when, being thirty years old, He began His ministry. They do not contain a regular life, that is, a detail in order of time of His actions, but rather what would be called now anecdotes; that is, they give us perhaps some one story or some one speech of His at length, and then pass over some considerable time in silence, and then give a long account of some other story or speech, or give a short story in order to introduce some one of His speeches, or string together a set of short sayings of His all together, and so on. The one thing clearly in view is to give a just and full idea of our Saviour's character, and this kind of writing, if we would but make use of it, is singularly fitted for that end. But so it is, we have read the words so often, as is natural, and have generally taken so little pains to enter into their meaning, which has been chiefly our own fault in days of old, that we are as it were punished for it by the much greater difficulty we have in entering fully into what we read than what we otherwise might have felt: "the words fall on our ear like an old familiar sound, producing no impression and awakening no idea."

Now I would say, are we reading some story about our Lord? let us try and paint to ourselves His very form, and manner, and action: are we reading some speech of His? let us look carefully on what occasion it was delivered, and imagine to ourselves as best we can the scene at the time, let us try and think of His very expression of countenance and voice and gesture. This is a great advantage of pictures representing scenes of the New Testament, if any of us have means of seeing such: they help us so very much in forming clear ideas of the stories in the Gospels: at all events we ought as much as we can to fancy to ourselves a picture of every scene we there read of. Let us take, for instance, the story which so naturally occurs to us at the present time; the shepherds coming in to worship the infant Jesus. Let us think first of the manger itself with the brute cattle about it, and in one corner of it the child

with His mother; let us think of that mother's countenance as knowing and keeping to herself the great secret of the manner of that child's birth; and then let us think of the body of shepherds rushing in and bowing down to the Babe in the cradle as the promised deliverer of their nation, and straightway going out and filling the ears of every one with the wonders they had seen and heard. But it will generally be far more useful to dwell on scenes where our Lord Himself is the principal personage; as a definite idea of Him as He was is the great thing to be aimed at. I will read you a passage from a most Christian and affecting writer explaining in the manner I mean the three first verses of John vi. "After these things Jesus went over the Sea of Galilee, which is the Sea of Tiberias; and a great multitude followed Him because they saw His miracles which He did on them that were diseased; and Jesus went up into a mountain, and there He sat with His disciples." "Now suppose," says this writer, "this passage to be read to his children by the master of a family, how many would hear it without interest and without receiving any clear ideas from it. But suppose he could show to his children the real scene mentioned; and taking his family to some hill from whence they could behold the whole country of Galilee, actually see what this describes. 'Do you observe,' he might say, 'that wide sea which fills the whole extent of the valley beneath us? that is the Sea of Tiberias, called also the Sea of Galilee: all this country round it is Galilee, those distant mountains are in Galilee, and that beautiful wood is a Galilean forest: but look! do you see that small boat coming round? it is slowly making its way across the water; we may almost hear the plashing of the oars. It contains the Saviour and some of His disciples. They are steering towards Tiberias—they approach the shore—they stop at the landing and the Saviour followed by His disciples walks out upon the shore.' Suppose now this party of observers to remain a little longer at their post, and see in a short time that some sick person is brought to the Saviour to be healed: another and another comes, a crowd gradually collects around Him: He retreats slowly up the rising ground, and after a little time is seen to take His place upon an elevated spot where He can overlook and address the throng which has collected around Him." Now I am far from saying it will be easy for any of us to set about reading the four Gospels in this manner; no bad habit whatever is easy to get rid of, and this inveterate habit of reading the mere words of the stories without taking in their full meaning is not more easy to get rid of than any other habit; but surely it is worth while taking some little pains to acquire what will be found so very important a help towards that real and hearty faith in Jesus Christ which can alone support us in this weary and sinful life, against all the besetting temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

The portions of Scripture selected for the Gospels of the different Sundays and Holydays in the year, will many of them, I think, be found a very useful selection for those who wish to begin this habit. It will be best, I should think, to take some one of the shorter stories of our Lord contained in them as a beginning, and read it over and over carefully with this view, till we should be able ourselves to tell the same story in different words, and to stand any cross questioning as to the circumstances attending them. Or again we might take the account of our Lord's raising Lazarus in John xi., which is too long to be selected as the Gospel for any day, but is one of the most affecting of all the scenes in our Lord's life; and is moreover one which I think will be found more easy to conceive distinctly than many others are. And then, when we have conceived distinctly this or any other story, let us call to mind that He of whom he has been reading is no other than Almighty God, surrounded by His sinful creatures whom He has come from Heaven to redeem. This will not, I suppose, be done without a degree of attention which at first will be rather painful, and at first, moreover, will only be imperfectly done: but then, like everything else, it will very much improve by practice: it will become far more easy, and also we shall do it better, till at last we may hope it will become our only natural way of reading the four Gospels. And it will help us, I think, if from the time we begin this practice we never allow ourselves to read that part of the Bible in any other way: we shall still have the other parts of New Testament, and also the long speeches of our Lord, as, *e.g.*, the Sermon on the Mount in St. Matthew, and our Lord's discourse to his disciples after the last supper in St. John; but we shall find great help in never suffering ourselves to read about any action of our Lord's without trying to fix in our minds a picture, as it were, of what is described.

If any are inclined to begin such a plan at once, by the time the week before Easter comes round, which is called Passion week, they will find themselves, I think, able to follow the story of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion, which is read in church on the different days of that week, with an interest and a feeling of the reality they have before had no idea of. They may without difficulty follow Him in their mind, from His last supper to His agony in the garden; from thence surrounded by the multitude to the judgment hall; they may dwell on His conduct and His answers there, His appearance before the Roman governor, and so on with all the circumstances of that awful scene, until He is fixed on the cross, and dying commends His mother to the care of His beloved disciple, and gives up the ghost. And so on Easter day, and afterwards, they may bring clearly before their eyes His different and miraculous appearances in His glorified body, till in sight of all His disciples, He ascended

with it into Heaven, there to sit at the right hand of God, and to plead His death with His Heavenly Father, and ever to make intercession for us His redeemed creatures, whom He has left below, struggling by His gracious help with all those sins and temptations which without ceasing thwart and trouble us in our endeavours to attain that place in Heaven which He has purchased for us with His own blood, and has gone before to prepare for us.

And when we have accustomed ourselves to thoughts such as these, it will no longer be difficult to bring home to our hearts that God always sees us, that everything we do must be done to His glory. You remember when our Lord "turned and looked upon Peter." Whenever we read of Him, whatever circumstances in His life, let us remember that that same countenance is fixed on each one of us, either in pleasure or in displeasure, in every instant of our lives; in our work, in our rest, at our meals, in the light of day, in the darkness and solitude of night, that eye "is about our path and about our bed, and spieth out all our ways." And can there be a more winning and commanding motive to obedience than that so presented to us? Yes, there is one even more winning and commanding; it is the eye not merely of Him who made us and requires our obedience, but of Him who redeemed us and tenderly loves us. He who loved St. John, who in the agonies of death commended His mother to his care, He who wept over the grave of Lazarus, He loves us in like manner as He loved St. John and Lazarus. He died for us, He would willingly gather the full fruits of his passion. He is always far more ready and anxious to receive us than we, alas! to turn to Him, He has promised the help of His Holy Spirit to all who will but ask it, He has promised by His apostle that with every temptation He will make also a way to escape "that we may be able to bear it;" and shall we, for want of our poor exertions, make such love and such promises of none effect?

But this I would address rather to those who have already in earnest wished to obey their God and Saviour, whether they be such as stand and require to be strengthened, or weak-hearted and require to be comforted and helped, or lastly, are even in danger of falling away as being beset by trials and temptations sore to bear, and which appear almost above their strength: let these last especially fix their hopes on the sure mercies of that Saviour who has already done so much for them and will never desert those who earnestly and in faith seek Him. But to him who has as yet lived in fact without God in the world, who, whatever his outward conduct and profession, has really been influenced by motives of this world alone, to him, whether living in actual open sin or in mere godlessness and hardness of heart, the love of Christ will appear a strange thing; or if it does not, if this time of Christmas, *e.g.* has at all touched his heart with the greatness of God's mercies, and there is something

to all minds, from whatever cause, so winning in the services of this season, that such a thing is not improbable, let him not deceive himself by supposing that such a feeling on the surface of his heart is at all of the nature of true religion. I will tell him what it is; it is a fresh call from God to give his heart to heavenly things, and if he dare again neglect that call, it will only add to his condemnation at the last day. It is not religion, but it is that which may make his first steps in religion less repulsive and distasteful. If he would know what religious feeling is, he must begin by hearty repentance and self-abasement before God: let him rather think of John the Baptist, who prepared the way for faith in our Lord by preaching "Repent ye," "The axe is laid to the root of the trees: every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire," or if he does think of Jesus Christ, let him think of Him as his future judge; as Him who will come and call him to account for his thoughts, words, and actions, one by one at the last day. His proud heart must be crushed and humbled, his sinful mind awakened to some degree of knowledge of itself, before he may dare think himself at peace with God. Nor would I mean that any of us can afford to forget the terrors of the Lord, His threats as well as His promises, so long as our best feelings are uncertain and precarious. While the temptations of the world without and our own sinful nature within are so constant and powerful; while our actual sins in God's sight are so numberless, we can ill spare any one support of our Christian principles; much less one so continually enforced in Scripture. And accordingly we find in our Church those very thoughts I have mentioned of the Baptist's preaching, and of the last judgment joined together in the services of the solemn season of Advent, which we have so lately passed, as the best preparation of the earnest Christian for the joyful time we now celebrate.

But for those whose heart is really, even if as yet but faintly, engaged in the service of God, the more habitual frame of mind, and at this season the one especially befitting them, is a deep and devoutly grateful sense of the privilege they enjoy as being by adoption sons of God. Does any one of us fully bring before himself all that is contained in those few words? Christ has become, if we may say it, our brother; God is our reconciled and tender Father. Let me be allowed to read you a passage on this subject, which I am glad to be able to do, as conveying ideas of all the most important to be ever in our minds, and which few have the gift of so expressing as in any adequate manner to convey them. "Jesus Christ of whom we read in the four Gospels, even He beholds thee individually, whoever thou art. He calls thee by thy name; He sees thee and understands thee as He made thee, He knows what is in thee, all thy own peculiar feelings and thoughts,

thy dispositions and likings, thy strength and thy weakness. He views thee in thy day of rejoicing and thy day of sorrow, He sympathises in thy hopes and thy temptations. He interests himself in all thy anxieties and remembrances, all the risings and fallings of thy spirit. He has numbered the very hairs of thy head, and the cubits of thy stature. He compasses thee round and bears thee in His arms: He takes thee up and sets thee down. He notes thy very countenance, whether smiling or in tears, whether healthful or sickly. He looks tenderly upon thy hands and thy feet; He hears thy voice, the beating of thy heart, and thy very breathing. Thou dost not love thyself better than He loves thee: thou canst not shrink from pain more than He dislikes thy bearing it; and if He puts it on thee it is as thou wilt put it on thyself if thou art wise, for a greater good afterwards. Thou art not only His creature (though for the very sparrows He has a care, and pitied the 'much cattle' of Nineveh), thou art man redeemed and sanctified, God's adopted son, favoured with a portion of that glory and blessedness which flows from God everlastingly unto the only begotten. Thou art chosen to be His even above thy fellows who dwell in the east and south. Thou wast one of those for whom He offered up His last prayer, and sealed it with his precious blood. 'I pray not for these alone, but for them also which shall believe in me through their word,' even for us—'that they all may be one; as Thou Father art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us.'[1] What a thought is this! a thought almost too great for our faith: scarce can we refrain from acting Sarah's part when we bring it before us, and 'laugh' for amazement and perplexity. What is man, what are we, what am I, that the Son of God should be so mindful of me? What am I that He should have raised me from almost a devil's nature to that of angel? That He should Himself dwell personally in this very heart of mine, making me His temple? What am I that the Holy Ghost should enter into me and draw up my thoughts heavenwards with plaints unutterable?" Nothing can possibly be added to this most affecting description of the state of blessedness which it is our privilege to enjoy if we ourselves would but heartily believe it to be ours.

Lastly, Jesus Christ "has left us an example that ye should walk in His steps;"[2] and this is a privilege which we may not neglect. Let any one read our Lord's history diligently and carefully in the manner I have been urging, and he will become by God's grace slowly and insensibly another man. I do not wish to undervalue direct precepts and advice; far indeed from it, we are most unwise and most sinful if we neglect to profit by any means of grace offered to us; but I do say—let us, in the strong

[1] John xvii. 20.

[2] 1 Peter ii. 21.

language of Scripture, eat our Lord's flesh and drink His blood; let us support our souls by the thought of Him, as we support our bodies by meat and drink; let us have His image before us, not only as our hope and comfort, but as our example, and it will of itself do far more for us than all other means together in purity, meekness, contentment, resignation to the will of God,—to mention no more. We shall astonish others and ourselves by the advance we shall make towards "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ,"[1] as we are more and more "conformed to the image of Him,"[2] who as on the one hand the "first-born of every creature" the perfect pattern of man's nature, so on the other hand is "the express image of God's person." And as we grow in grace and in the love of our blessed Lord, going through this vale of misery, we shall more and more use it well, and the pools thereof will be filled with water; for the Father and the Son will come unto us and make their abode with us.[3] Jesus Christ will Himself look down from Heaven, and lead us by the hand, if we will but submit to His guidance, through the troubles and temptations of this weary world, until through the gate of death He shall bring us to everlasting life, where we shall enjoy the fulness of the presence of Him whom here we have loved in our measure by faith; "where the Lamb shall feed us, and shall lead us unto living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from our eyes,"[4] "for we shall see Him as He is, and shall be purified even as He is pure."

O God, whose blessed Son was manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil, and make us the sons of God and heirs of everlasting life, grant, we beseech Thee, that having this hope we may purify ourselves even as He is pure; that when He shall appear again with power and great glory, we may be made like unto Him in His eternal and glorious kingdom, where with Thee, O Father, and Thee, O Holy Ghost, He liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end.

[1] Eph. iv. 13. [2] Rom. viii. 29. [3] John xiv. 23.
[4] Rev. vii. 17.

## APPENDIX B

The following extracts from a sermon—written by Mr. Ward probably in 1839 or 1840—have reference to his theory that Obedience is the appointed path to religious knowledge.

JOHN vii. 17.—*If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.*

SUCH are our Lord's words as we heard read in church the other day, in speaking to the Jews of His divine mission, "my doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me." We read a little before that "there was a murmuring among the people concerning Him; for some said he is a good man, others said nay, but he deceiveth the people." And to the people, so divided in opinion concerning Him, He seems to say in the text, if we may venture to enlarge His sacred words: "If any man *will*—that is, if any man choose to do God's will, if any man from this time resolve to do his duty in every respect so far as he knows it, and so far as he is able, in matters great and small as they happen and in God's sight, if any man resolve to commit himself into God's hands, not knowing whither he goes" (Heb. xi. 8), "if he resolve by God's grace not to flinch from any duty which may come from Him, how strange and grievous soever, trusting in His special providence over His faithful servants that He will not tempt them above that they are able, if he resolve to follow eagerly and gladly the faintest glimmering of a light which seems to be from God,—such an one, as he advances in his course of true and acceptable obedience, will more and more see that my words are God's words, that my message is from God. The many among you, those whose chief aim is to be decent and respectable, who observe the ordinances of their religion as being a decent and respectable thing to do, but who think little of disobedience in very small matters and on occasion, who are well contented with what light they have,—nay, so far from being anxiously on the look-out for more, rather fear the intrusion of more, lest it impose on them a heavier burden and a stricter task,—such men as these, who dream

of religion, not practise it, will be offended at my doctrines as contrary to the very law which I profess to revere, or will rail at me as bringing in idle and useless divisions, and disturbing the harmony of the nation by dwelling on things as important and necessary which, whether true or not, are plainly far from important or necessary. 'But wisdom is justified of her children.'[1] My elect, who have been purged and purified by a course of strict obedience, see more and more the real divinity of the doctrines which I teach; that the 'law came by Moses,' 'the shadow of good things to come, not the reality, but that grace and truth came by Me.'"

This same great doctrine, that obedience is the one path to religious truth, is urged in different shapes in very many passages of Scripture. To speak of only one, which seems almost a type of the whole lesson in question: what is the whole of John the Baptist's mission but one continued inculcation of this? He came, as we know, to "make ready a people prepared for the Lord."[2] Now, how did he this? he worked no miracle, he preached no new truth; he enforced upon them the duty of doing at once what they well knew to be right. "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." "Now also the axe is laid to the root of the trees; every tree, therefore, which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." As though he said, "Now is the accepted time; amend your lives by the rule of God's commandments before it be too late: soon the light will show itself in the world; if ye be still in your sins when it shall show itself ye will reject it and bring on yourselves condemnation: and this is the condemnation, that men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." And to the people he said: "He that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none;" and to the publicans, "Exact no more than that which is appointed you;" and to the soldiers, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely;" to all, then, he gave no new commandment, no new truth, but he urged on them the very first principles of the law they professed, as a beginning from which they were to proceed to higher obedience.

. . . . . .

I am not now, however, going to speak of the efficacy of obedience in leading us to the first acknowledgment of divine truths (though this, indeed, is perhaps a much more practical subject to us all than seems at first sight), but rather to its power in enabling us to grasp and realise what we have long since professed to believe; and this is indeed to *know* of the doctrine whether it be of God; rightly to apprehend divine truth is to perceive it to be divine. Unbelievers are always (from their own fault, indeed) misapprehenders. When fairly set before the mind it carries its own

[1] Matt. xi. 19. [2] Luke i. 17.

evidence with it; and I say the one great means which we have that it may fairly be set before our minds is strict obedience.

But it is not only with those who are disposed to erroneous doctrines that the truth holds; it no less applies to each one of us, in a manner probably much more practically interesting to us, that before the beginning of a course of steady, self-denying obedience we can have no real apprehension of religious truth. The apostles seem plainly to have put before their converts, as well as before the unbelieving multitude, the plain elements of duty before the high mysteries of the Gospel. And we see just the same thing in the way of nature; for observe, infants are, we know, baptized, and from the very first dawn of reason their religious course must begin. Now, how soon do they become capable of and do, in fact, exercise themselves in lessons of obedience, faith, and self-denial? How long do they go on in these habits before we can possibly, be we ever so desirous of doing it, make them understand or act upon the great objects of Christian faith? And if we have neglected God's appointed order of instruction, if we have fallen from our childlike innocence and sullied our baptismal purity (alas! how few of us have not), we must be converted and become like little children if we would enter into the kingdom of heaven. We must learn of them: "Lord, I am not high-minded, I have no proud looks, I do not exercise myself in great matters which are too high for me, but I refrain my soul and keep it low like a child that is weaned from his mother,"[1] —that is, in the words of a living commentator, as the weaned child lies on its mother's breast peacefully and without any longing for what before it sought impetuously, so my soul lies motionless in me, weaned from all its desires and wills, and confiding in God. Such is the right feeling of a beginner in religious obedience, though in one sense, indeed, we are all beginners; he will not think himself worthy of any sudden burst of religious light, but keeping his soul low, he will wait for God's good time in gradually bringing him forward to the knowledge of divine things.

Obedience comes first, knowledge afterwards; it is by being pure in heart that we see God, not by seeing God that we first become pure in heart; the Holy Ghost leads those who yield themselves to Him, first to the amendment of their hearts, and then to the great objects of faith. Now if this be so, how thoroughly mistaken and unhappy are they who think they begin a really religious life by regularly coming to church, praying morning and evening, and reading the Scriptures, right and necessary though these be, and fancy that in course of time a thorough obedience of will and thought to God will, as it were, naturally follow. I do not scruple to say that the very opposite course is nearer the truth; men have been good

[1] Ps. cxxxi.

Christians before now who have not had the Scriptures, no man has ever been a good Christian who has not had self-denial. I say it would be nearer the right course to begin by exercising ourselves day by day in a life of obedience for Christ's sake and as in God's sight, and not think ourselves worthy of coming to church or reading the Scriptures till we had made some progress in such a life. I do not say that would be a right course; it would be a very wrong one. God allows us from the very beginning the great privilege of seeking Him in prayer (especially where most He is found, in His church), and of reading His sacred words in Scripture. But till we have begun this course of unswerving devotion to His will, in all things great and small as they occur through the day, we have not been really capable of any religious exercises at all; our reading of Scripture, or prayer, or thought of Christ, has been the dream of religion, not the substance. Obedience is the very air in which religious faith lives; without obedience it languishes and dies.

. . . . . .

The same lesson is taught us by the preaching of the Apostles and Evangelists in the book of Acts, in which religious truth is ever revealed to individuals in proportion to their actual advance in religious obedience. The first principles of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come are urged upon Felix, while the elders of Ephesus are reminded of the divine nature and the sacrifice of Christ, and the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the Church; while among those converts who were made the chief instruments of spreading the Gospel at first, or who are honoured with especial favour in Scripture, none are found who had not been faithful to the light already given them, and distinguished, previous to their conversion, by a strictly conscientious deportment. Such then is the great proof vouchsafed to us by God of the truth of what we have been taught; a proof open alike to learned and unlearned, so they be simple-minded, childlike, and obedient; closed alike from high and low, rich and poor, who are without those graces. God has "hid these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them unto babes." He who learns the truth from argument or from mere trust in man may lose it again by argument or by trust in men; but he who learns it by obedience can lose it only by disobedience, "he that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself."[1] And hear our Lord's own words as to the security of that faith which is built upon obedience: "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him to a wise man which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock. And every one

[1] 1 John v. 10.

that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall of it."[1] Let each one of us, then, if unhappily as yet we have it not, try anxiously to learn the habit of acting on religious truth as soon as we have gained it; and looking eagerly for more. Let us try to learn the habit of dwelling upon religion not as a matter of curious interest, much less of rude argument, but of deep practical importance; nor need we doubt that in proportion as we acquire this blessed habit, the Holy Ghost will lead us step by step away from all serious error. Our way of expressing our thoughts may still be ever so erroneous, but our thoughts themselves will be in the main true and good; and truth, like obedience, is of the heart, not of the lips. The guides we still follow may themselves be ever so blind, but to us their words will convey a truth that they themselves perhaps dream not of: "I have more understanding than my teachers, for thy testimonies are my study." God speaks to us first by our parents, next perhaps by our schoolmasters and teachers, next by His ministers; all these different instructions come as we know from God; we know it, if from no other reason, from the very fact that we are in the natural course of things brought under them. And these different instructors may perhaps seem to speak on some subjects a very different language from each other, but he who goes from one to other, grasping and realising all doctrine as it is put before him, and at once acting upon it, will even without knowing it, have what is false crumble away under his grasp from its own rottenness, while he more and more grows into and makes part of himself what is true. And so it is that frequently God's faithful servants speak a very different language from each other, and think their differences very wide; not that there is really more than one narrow way which leads to salvation, but that those who in reward of their obedience have really been guided into the true way, keep nevertheless the sounds taught them, and the ways of expression common among those teachers, who, themselves in error, have yet been God's instruments in leading them to truth. Not that at last obedience by itself will lead them into all the truth, though it will rescue them from error. Those who obeyed John Baptist's preaching ever so faithfully did not find out Christ's doctrine for themselves, but they received and acknowledged it when He came; they found that in His teaching, in His very bearing and manner, what exactly answered to the wants and cravings they felt within them, and which "declared unto them" what they had "ignorantly worshipped." And so, though in ever so diminished a measure, God's

[1] Matt. vii. 24-27.

truth, spoken though it be by fallible man, has on the whole in it that voice of God Himself which is recognised as His voice by His elect, by those who have trained themselves in such obedience as I have described. If we are such, we need no other evidence: we embrace and act upon it. Yet every day of so acting brings with it a fuller and more consoling certainty, for "all who venture for Christ receive daily returns in confirmation of their choice."

## APPENDIX C

**Recollections of W. G. Ward at Oxford, by The Very Rev. W. C. Lake, Dean of Durham.**

DEAR MR. WARD—When you asked me last year to give you some of my impressions of your father's character and influence in the days when I best knew him at Oxford, I felt at once that the person who would have been incomparably the most able to do this was the late Dean of Westminster, especially from his graphic power, and from his early intimacy with your father. I was never on exactly the same terms with him as Stanley was. But as he and others who knew your father well, such as Archbishop Tait and Dr. Oakeley, have now passed away, I will do my best to put together a few notes which may help to recall the remembrances of a time now equally dear and touching to me.

From the year 1835 to 1840—*i.e.* during the whole period of his tutorship at Balliol—no tutor in Oxford seems to me to have had so much intellectual influence over his pupils as W. G. Ward. It was no doubt in some respects an influence of a peculiar kind, and was perhaps mainly due to his extraordinary intellectual activity and animation; for these were so great that even when his friend or pupil entirely declined to follow him to his practical conclusion, he was for a time held, as it were, in the tight grip of his logic; and his points were always so forcibly and unhesitatingly put—though sometimes, it might be said, paradoxically—that they left their traces upon many of us for life. I ought, however, to add that this was more strongly felt in Balliol than in the rest of the University. It was the few who lived with him familiarly over whom he obtained this strong intellectual influence; on the rest of the University his influence was rather that of the ideas which he scattered broadcast. He himself was regarded by most of those, even among his theological friends, [who met him only casually and in general university society], as recklessly paradoxical.

The first time I ever heard of him was in a letter, which I was reading lately, from Stanley to myself (I was then a boy at Rugby, in the year 1834). "Last night," he says, "a large moon-faced

man, Ward, formerly of Ch. Ch., now of Lincoln, rushed into Faber's rooms (Father Faber), and seeing me, inquired at once when the new volume of Arnold's sermons was to be out;" and he went on to describe him as an ardent follower of Archbishop Whately and admirer of Arnold. This was Ward's "phase" for two or three years, till about 1837, and while his "Arnoldism" was acceptable enough to some of us who were still under the rod of the same magician, we could not quite stand his "*Whatelyisms*," which startled not a little some of my own intimate friends, particularly S. Waldegrave, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle, and then and always a most zealous Evangelical, and E. M. Goulbourn, now Dean of Norwich. Goulbourn, whose keen humour played, though in a very kindly manner, with everything and everybody in college, very soon knew Ward by no other name than the "Fat Fellow"; and Ward, on the other hand, had a malicious pleasure in assailing Goulbourn, sometimes not over-reverently, for his intense Bibliolatry. With Waldegrave, who had no touch of humour in his character, and who regarded Ward with a comic mixture of liking and horror, he never ventured to approach the subject.

Coming to Oxford, as I did, some four or five years after your father, I can give you no full account of his undergraduate life, of which you will probably have heard from others. But his reading had been rather idle and desultory, and unless I am mistaken, it was only some loss of fortune by your grandfather which determined him to stand for a Fellowship. He was not ready to go into the schools at the time prescribed by Christ Church (which then, together with Balliol, was strict in allowing only *three* undergraduate years), and by some luck managed to get a late scholarship at Lincoln, where he resided two or three terms before his election to Balliol. He was elected to an open Fellowship, when he rather startled his competitors by stretching himself on the floor of the Master's dining-room and going to sleep for an hour before he began his essay.

He always spoke as if during his undergraduate days the Union was the great stimulus of his intellectual life, and his conversation was rich in stories of the debates. "Here comes old Ward, the walking incarnation of the Union," exclaimed once Lord Cardwell, as he saw him sauntering in to a late breakfast-party at Balliol. He always maintained that for life and energy of discussion the Union was in its best days in his time—better than even in the preceding generation of Mr. Gladstone, when it had scarcely attained its maturity. I have lost sight of the Union now for nearly forty years, and I believe the last speech I heard was one of Lord Salisbury's, then Lord Robert Cecil, a young undergraduate at Christ Church, and an uncommonly good one it was. I remember being much struck with its ease and its clever repartee, and always prophesied that the man who made it would some day take a great

place in public life. And certainly both in Ward's and the following generation the Union did a great deal for us in giving us self-confidence and readiness of speech. It had then a goodly list of speakers, Roundell Palmer (afterwards Lord Chancellor Selborne), Robert Lowe (Lord Sherbrooke), E. Cardwell (Lord Cardwell), A. C. Tait (afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury), all spoke frequently and with great vigour, and of one and all of them Ward had many stories to tell. It would be unfair to omit one who was in some respects the most effective speaker of them all, George (afterwards Canon) Trevor, whose finishing achievement was a vehement onslaught on the then committee of the Union and all its leaders, which gave Oxford a whole term of animated private debates (the Easter term of 1835); and though I am afraid that the ingratitude of recent generations has now entirely forgotten it, this was long remembered as the grand recorded occasion of Union declamation and invective.

His Union career was too great a feature in Ward's Oxford life to be omitted; but I pass on to a period when I knew him much better, having come up to Balliol as a scholar in 1835, and found him just beginning work as mathematical tutor. I was in a certain sense his pupil, though for a very short time, as I was not reading mathematics; but his relations with some of his pupils, especially Stanley and myself, and afterwards (still more closely) with Clough, were almost solely those of an intimate friend. Both Stanley and Clough he indeed absorbed to an extent which was far from popular with their friends. His whole life may then be said to have consisted in his conversation, and to us younger men it was to a wonderful extent powerful and attractive. One might almost say that he was the last of the great Conversationalists—at least, I have never met any one at all like or equal to him since,—and held a place, in a different sphere, and with much younger men, like that which S. T. Coleridge held in the eyes of Frederic Maurice and Sterling, at Highgate.

His reading and his opinions were, and continued to be for some years, a rather curious mixture. In philosophy he was, or believed himself to be, a thorough Benthamite, and devoted especially to "young Mill," whose articles in the *London Review* of those days we all eagerly devoured. Without ever having been an "Arnoldian," he was a warm admirer of Arnold as well as Whately, and on a visit to Arnold so plied him with his pitiless logic, and on every sort of question, that he left him in a fever, which actually confined him for some days to bed. But all this was temporary: the man who really enthralled him, as his subsequent life showed, was Cardinal, then Mr. Newman. I have some difficulty in saying what first drew him to Newman,—probably simply attendance at his sermons, and perhaps a habit of discussing all matters human and divine with Stanley, who for a time was rather Newmanistic himself, and of whom Ward once

told me that he was kept by him with difficulty from joining Newman altogether. I suspect, however, from Stanley's whole character, that the adhesion would have been a very temporary one.

But the fact is that Newman's influence, direct and indirect, over nearly all the more thoughtful of the undergraduates, for the four or five years when he was at the zenith of his power, was a thing which it is difficult now to describe, looking back at it at the distance of fifty years, without either the appearance or the reality of exaggeration. It was no doubt mainly due to his sermons, which, singularly simple in appearance, were soon felt to possess that wonderful combination of religious elevation and intellectual force and beauty which is attractive everywhere, but above all to young men just entering life at an University. I will not attempt to describe them. This has been admirably done by one of my oldest friends, the late Professor Shairp: but this I may say, that I cannot imagine a higher tribute to Cardinal Newman than the high tone of moral feeling which, so far as I can judge (and I had large means of judging), prevailed in the Oxford society of young men during the period of his influence. No doubt it was rather a peculiar time: with something perhaps of "the torrent's smoothness ere it dash below"; sceptical questions had not come on: Coleridge and Mill were still our only philosophers: Arnold, who was regarded with something of horror by many of the High Church, had never held any language than that "belief in Christ was simply identical with moral goodness"; but allowing for all this, I cannot but think that the high and unworldly tone of University life in Newman's day was a remarkable phenomenon, and was chiefly due to him. Ward was only one of many to whom he may be said to have been a spiritual father.

I hope you will forgive me this digression, for which my only apology is the remembrance of some of the happiest days of life. I do not at all speak as if the young men of those days had anything like a dead uniformity of *opinion*. Ward's chief sphere of talk, for instance, was the Balliol Common Room, and there for some three years after I first knew it as a Fellow, he and the late Archbishop Tait had their almost daily, and always most friendly, battle. They were, in different ways, equally able, and, I may add, to their old pupils equally lovable. Tait, a born Scotchman, was perhaps, of all men in Oxford, the most distinct antithesis to Newmanism, and we some of us charged him with being too imaginative to understand Newman's character. He saw too, better than most of us, how things were really going, and was by no means happy in finding that many of his attached pupils were drifting away from him. This might in ordinary men have led to feelings of theological bitterness between him and Ward; but it is a proof of the large and generous character of the

two men that nothing of the kind ever occurred. And even after Tait had first roused the University authorities to attack Newman by his protest against Tract No. 90, and Ward had been turned out of his tutorship in consequence of his pamphlet on the occasion, the friendship of the two men continued as before,—each really admired and valued the other. I have met Ward on visits to Tait both at Rugby and at Fulham, and the last publication of the Archbishop contains an affectionate tribute to Ward and Dr. Oakeley, as two of the most devoted and high-minded men he had ever known.

I am afraid I have been led on to write at greater length than I intended, and yet I feel that there is much in your father's intellectual life and character which I must have omitted. What I have mainly wished to convey to you is that he was a great centre of intellectual life to us as undergraduates and as Junior Fellows, and if I cannot but think that his influence was somewhat alloyed by his love of paradox, and the haste with which he jumped at his conclusions, I feel also that this was in great part compensated by his candour, his singleness of purpose, and the honesty and courage with which he followed out his convictions. It was no ordinary charm to young men to be in constant contact with one who had so thoroughly the courage of his opinions. May I add that I hope we were equally influenced by his high example of purity and religious sincerity?—I am, dear Mr. Ward, yours very faithfully, W. C. LAKE, *Dean of Durham.*

*October* 1, 1886.

## APPENDIX D

**Recollections of W. G. Ward, and of the Oxford Movement, by the Rev. B. Jowett, Master of Balliol.**

[In publishing the following recollections of my father, which I owe to the kindness of Professor Jowett, I need hardly say that I am not able to accept in every particular his account either of the Tractarian party or of my father's own views. The affection and respect with which he speaks of my father, and the genial relations which existed between the two men in private life, are of course the more remarkable from the fact that Professor Jowett was unable to understand or sympathise with the aims of the Oxford school. This is not the place to comment in detail upon incidental statements in a paper for which I owe the writer my most grateful acknowledgments, and which adds so much to the value of my book; I will only suggest—and I know he will not misunderstand my doing thus much—that with reference to the Tractarians, as in the case of any party consisting of men of unequal acquirements and ability, criticisms may be made with some truth upon individual members, which do not apply to the representative minds. I am led to note this by observing that Coleridge and Wordsworth are two of the writers whom the Tractarians are said by Professor Jowett to have regarded "with suspicion"; yet Keble has spoken of Wordsworth as "divinæ veritatis antistes,"[1] and Newman in 1839 referred to Coleridge as "providing a philosophical basis for [the Oxford Movement]," as "instilling a higher philosophy into inquiring minds than they had been accustomed to accept."][2]

DEAR MR. WARD—You have asked me to give you my recollections of your father when he was at Oxford. They go far back into the past. During the latter half of his life I saw him only two or three times—once at Cowes in the Isle of Wight about twenty-five years ago, and again more than once at Freshwater ten or eleven years ago. Though he was attached to Balliol College and

[1] See Dedication of Keble's *Prelectiones Academicæ*.

[2] See *British Critic*, vol. xxv. p. 400.

had an extraordinary memory of the ways of the place, and of all that was said and done there in his own time, he could never be persuaded to revisit his old haunts; he was not in Oxford, I think, after he left the English Church. But between the years 1838, when I was elected a Fellow of Balliol, and 1845, during term time I used to see him daily, and I shall always have a great affection for his memory. My contemporaries and friends in those days, Arthur Stanley, B. C. Brodie, Hugh Pearson, Arthur Hugh Clough, the Bishop of London, the Deans of Durham and Norwich, Lord Coleridge, Constantine Prichard, and others who were his friends as well as mine, though of different ages, were all, like myself, several years his juniors.

The Fellows of Balliol at that time were a very united body, and not undistinguished. (1) There was John Carr, the senior Fellow, a refined gentleman and scholar, full of humourous sayings and out-of-the-way learning, but fanciful and eccentric. He was believed to have been disappointed in love, and the disappointment seemed to have left a mark on his character. He was grave and solitary. He used to laugh sadly, as if he were taking himself to task for ever indulging in mirth. He was a sort of person who, if he had lived two centuries earlier, might have been the author of Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*. He would read all the morning, and after dinner bring out of his treasure house some quaint saying or curious anecdote, which he found or pretended to have found in a recondite or unknown author.[1] He could scarcely be said to have studied with a purpose. (2) Next to him on the list of Fellows was Frederic Oakeley, an elegant writer and a great lover of music, much respected by us. He became a member of the Roman Church about the same time as your father, and led the life of a saint among the Catholic poor in London. (3) Ten years younger than either of these, and a contemporary of your father's, was A. C. Tait, who had been a Scholar and Exhibitioner, and was a Fellow and Tutor of the College, full of sense, humour, and kindness, a shrewd Scotchman, as he was sometimes thought, who at that time, between the years 1835 and 1842, devoted to the College the great qualities which afterwards made him eminent in the world. From early days it was predicted of him that he would become Archbishop of Canterbury. He was one of the few by whom high preferment was never sought and to whom it did no harm. He was always kind and tolerant, and had something of the statesman in his nature. He never forgot an old friend, even when differences of opinion might have made it convenient to drop him. In his later years,

[1] One of his inventions which I happen to remember is worth preserving: "Vera sunt vera ac falsa sunt falsa. At si ecclesia dixerit vera esse falsa ac falsa esse vera, tum vera sunt falsa ac falsa sunt vera." This oracular saying he brought out with great seriousness as a quotation from Bellarmine.

when Archbishop, he used to pay an annual visit to the College and to preach in the College chapel. (4) There was J. M. Chapman, a good man, meek and gentle, but not at all learned or able, and rather prejudiced. (5) P. H. S. Payne, a man of noble and simple character, remembered by few, for he died early; an Ireland scholar, and a friend of the late Professor Halford Vaughan and the present Dean of Christ Church. He was of unusual stature. (6) And I must not forget the late Dean of Rochester, afterwards Master of the College, who was very kind to me in early life, an excellent man, though not liberal or enlightened, and a distinguished scholar, possessing stores of information on a great variety of subjects,—too much given to punning, but also a real humourist. He was the author of many ingenious mots, and famous for a copy of Greek Hexameters in which he described the Heads of Houses going to the installation of the Duke of Wellington. These admirable verses were long remembered and quoted in the University.

These were all our seniors, and most of them your father's contemporaries, with whom he held many an argument in the Common Room; and, like Socrates in the Symposium, never, I think, was worsted by any of them. There were two or three other Fellows, men who have left very pleasant recollections of themselves, such as (7) Lewis Owen, and (8) James Lonsdale—the latter an excellent scholar and teacher, with whom he was less acquainted. In those days the conversation in the Common Room used to flow fast and freely, for several of the Fellows were good talkers in their different ways. On one Sunday, soon after I was elected, I remember his bringing his father to dine with us—"the great Mr. William Ward," as he is still called in cricketing circles. On that Sunday it happened that his son had been preaching in chapel on the subject of apostasy, which led the elder Mr. Ward to discourse to us of the political apostasy of some of his parliamentary friends. On another occasion Dr. Arnold was entertained by us in the Common Room. Your father had formerly been his friend, and had lately attacked him with considerable asperity in the *British Critic*, so that the relations between them had become rather strained, and the conversation was carried on with difficulty. Visits to the Common Room made by Mr. Gladstone, Lord Dufferin, Lord Cardwell, a former Fellow, and other distinguished persons are also remembered by me.

In attempting to pourtray the Balliol of fifty years ago I must not forget the figure of the old Master, who was very different from any of the Fellows, and was held in considerable awe by them. He was a gentleman of the old school, in whom were represented old manners, old traditions, old prejudices, a Tory and a Churchman, high and dry, without much literature, but having a good deal

of character. He filled a great space in the eyes of the undergraduates. "His young men," as he termed them, speaking in an accent which we all remember, were never tired of mimicking his voice, drawing his portrait, and inventing stories about what he said and did. There was a time when at any party of Balliol men meeting in after life he would have been talked about. His sermon on the "Sin that doth so easily beset us," by which, as he said in emphatic and almost acrid tones, he meant "the habit of contracting debts," will never be forgotten by those who heard it. Nor indeed have I ever seen a whole congregation dissolved in laughter for several minutes except on that remarkable occasion. The ridiculousness of the effect was heightened by his old-fashioned pronunciation of certain words, such as "rayther," "wounded" (which he pronounced like "wow" in "bow-wow"). He was a considerable actor, and would put on severe looks to terrify Freshmen, but he was really kind-hearted and indulgent to them. He was in a natural state of war with the Fellows and Scholars on the Close Foundation; and many ludicrous stories were told of his behaviour towards them, of his dislike of smoking, and of his enmity to dogs. It was sometimes doubted whether he was a wit or not: I myself am strongly of opinion that he was. Some excellent things were undoubtedly said by him, but so fertile was the genius of undergraduates that, as in some early histories, it is impossible to separate accurately what is mythical from what is true in the accounts of him. One evening he suddenly appeared in Hall to strike terror into a riotous party, and found that the Master's health had been proposed and that an undergraduate was already on his legs returning thanks in his name. He was compared by John Carr to a famous old mulberry tree in the garden, well-known to all Balliol men; while of another mulberry tree newly planted, Carr said, "And that is Tait." He was short of stature and very neat in his appearance; the deficiency of height was more than compensated by a superfluity of magisterial or ecclesiastical dignity. He was much respected, and his great services to the College have always been acknowledged. But even now, at the distance of more than a generation, it is impossible to think of him without some humorous or ludicrous association arising in the mind. Your father and he had a liking for one another, which was, however, in some degree interrupted by their ecclesiastical differences.

To understand the great influence which, during a few years, your father exercised at Oxford, it is necessary to appreciate the state of the University. He came upon a time when the senior members, with the exception of Routh, the President of Magdalene, who belonged to the previous generation and was to us a *nominis umbra*, were comparatively undistinguished. Whately and

Copleston had been translated to another sphere; Blanco White, the celebrated convert from Catholicism, had ceased to reside; Hampden, the Regius Professor of Divinity, had little influence. It was an age of young men. J. H. Newman was only about thirty-seven years old, Pusey a year older, your father ten years younger.

None of the leaders of the Movement were, I think, at that time acquainted with German, except Dr. Pusey, who employed his knowledge for the most part in the refutation of the old German Rationalism. To say the truth, the learning of that day was of a rather attenuated sort. Dean Gaisford was probably the only person in the University who had a European reputation. Another, who was thought by your father and others to be a true genius, was the late Professor Donkin. Of him your father said to me in his manner: "Next to *the great man* he is the most distinguished person in Oxford." The energy and ability of that generation were out of proportion to their attainments. Hardly any one had read the works of Kant or Hegel, which have since exercised a great influence upon Oxford study. Very little was known of Plato. The philosophy of that day was contained in Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Rhetoric* and in Butler's *Analogy* and *Sermons*. These works, however, were not taken in their original meaning, but were adapted to current theology and the wants of the English Church; and they were valued as much for their defects as for their merits. Men found what they brought to them, and saw in them what they wished to see. There was very little true interpretation of any book in those days. Hampden alone was a real Aristotelian scholar. For political economy, for Locke, and for utilitarian philosophy, a supreme dislike and contempt was entertained. Coleridge and even Wordsworth were also regarded with suspicion, as in the tendency of their writings likely to be adverse rather than favourable to the Tractarian Movement. On the other hand there was a revival of Patristic study, which was pursued diligently but in the same uncritical spirit, and without much result. The writings of some of the older English divines, such as Andrews, Ken, Wilson (Bishop of Sodor and Man), Hammond, Bull, Beveridge, were reprinted and commended, perhaps more than they were read. There was a sympathy shown towards Nelson, Wharton, Alexander Knox, and other High Church laymen, while the foreign and English reformers (Luther, Cranmer, etc.) were steadily depreciated; and some of the old gossip of the days of the Reformation was revived about them. A distinction was maintained between the Roman Church before and after the Council of Trent, which was regarded not as the reform of the evils of the Catholic Church, but as the source of them, an opinion at variance with history, which several of the maintainers of it afterwards found out to be a mistake.

Among the predisposing causes of the Movement may be reckoned a reaction against the Reform Bill, or rather among the clergy a dislike and dread of it, and a fear of the evils which a Liberal Ministry would sooner or later bring upon the Church; the proposed reform of the Cathedrals, and the fear of national education becoming irreligious, or at least being no longer under the control of the Church of England. Lesser causes or at least signs of the approaching change were the publication of the *Christian Year*,—so different in spirit from any previous book of hymns; the Hampden controversy, beginning in 1836 on his appointment to the Regius Professorship of Divinity and ending about ten years later on his nomination to a Bishopric; the charge of Bishop Blomfield, in which he recommended the clergy to wear surplices in the pulpit, the sermons of J. H. Newman at St. Mary's, the *Tracts for the Times*. The Movement advanced with unequal steps. It was long before the High Church clergy in the country understood the purposes of their friends at Oxford. During the last twenty years, when it has been most silent, it has perhaps exerted a greater influence than previously, when many more books were written and it made a far greater noise in the world.

Like most periods of transition (I am speaking chiefly of the years between 1838 and 1846), the Tractarian Movement was not altogether consistent with itself. While some were for going forward to the Church of Rome, others were for standing on what they supposed to be the old paths. I remember your father telling me about the year 1844 (and he quoted a higher authority than his own) that "if the change was as great in the next eight years as in the eight years which had preceded, the Church of England would be in communion with the Church of Rome." The change of opinion from year to year had been imperceptible; but the difference after many years was found to be very great. The commonplaces of Conservatism were at first invoked, but soon tossed to the winds—especially by the younger adherents of the new opinions. Your father was one of these irreverent persons. I remember the consternation which he produced in the Balliol Common Room when a party of High Churchmen was present, by propounding the dictum that "the beheading of King Charles I. was the only thing to be done under the circumstances." The real spring of the Movement was the revival of the Catholic spirit which had long slumbered in England, and was now beginning to stir μέγας ἐν τούτοις θεὸς οὐδὲ γηράσκει. The intellectual elements seem at a distance to have been poor and slight, but they were enough to arouse the ecclesiastical spirit which was dormant in the University and among the clergy. The new views were more kindly received because they were believed to be the true but neglected doctrine of the Church of England; they were also thought to be the best safe-

guard against the Church of Rome. Of the influence which they exerted, and of the enthusiasm called forth by them, there can be no doubt. They aroused in many who did not wholly accept them a higher sense of duty and a wish to devote their lives to the service of their fellow men and of the Church. They led to many aspirations which were not destined to be fulfilled. They suggested many new ideas to the minds of persons who were unaccustomed to think; they were in harmony with the tendencies of the greater number among the clergy. "Thou marshall'st me the way that I am going," "is a good argument and will on;" but the Movement upon the whole was destructive rather than conservative, and many fine characters and good intellects were shipwrecked or stranded by it. Of course these opinions called forth a vehement opposition, not only on the part of the "high and dry," as they were termed, who were at that time in the ascendant at Oxford, but also of the Evangelical clergy who saw more clearly than the maintainers of them their inconsistency with the principles of the Reformation. They discovered afterwards that extremes meet; for many, who in their early homes had received an Evangelical education, found their final rest in the bosom of the Romish Church.

Your father soon perceived that the Anglican view of the Movement was untenable. It was not only illogical, but also unpractical. No man could have his mind in two Churches at once, any more than he could have his body in two places. No man could believe "in the whole cycle of Roman doctrine," and accept the thirty-nine Articles in a breath. About the year 1840 I remember your father telling me that the *via media* could no longer be maintained, and that Tractarianism must cease to be regarded as the safeguard against Rome. He had been under the charm of Mr. Newman's influence; about that time he began to assert himself. He had not much caution or reticence, but he had a great faculty of saying in clear language what he meant, and in some degree he precipitated the Movement towards the Church of Rome by his outspokenness.

The leaders of the Movement, though not deficient in the wisdom of the serpent, had no true knowledge of the world; they had never applied the lessons of ecclesiastical history to their own times. They did not consider that the string, if overstrained, would break, or that their own type of character was suited to a very few; it never occurred to them that the Movement which they had created would inevitably be followed by a reaction. Good and simple-minded and accomplished men as they were, and quite free from any taint of personal ambition, they do not seem to have understood that the power of the priest and of the confessional would no longer be endured in England; that we had put away casuistry, and were determined to place religion on a moral and historical basis. Nevertheless they rendered a signal service to the English Church

in making us regard our Catholic brethren in a kindlier and more sympathetic spirit. Henceforward the Church of Rome was to be regarded no longer as Antichrist, but in a manner more in accordance with Christian charity and with the truth of history.

I gladly pass from your father's theological position to my recollections of him in private life. He was one of the most genial men I have ever known, and a delightful companion. When in health he was always the same, ready to laugh or join in a laugh with any one. He had a friendly word for the College servants, with whom he was a great favourite. His conversation never flagged and was of all sorts. He had a great variety of jests, anecdotes, stories, of his own school days, or of his family, or of persons whom he had known. He was fond of reciting some mock-heroic verses in Latin and English, which he had composed when at Winchester school. He had a knowledge which was prodigious of the theatre and of theatrical persons and performances, acquired by long habit when he was a boy, of going to the pit; and he gratefully remembered the numberless "three and sixpences" which his parents had paid for him. This taste continued with him to the last. He had a great wish to meet Macready, who was a stranger to him, because he thought that they would both derive so much pleasure from their common reminiscences. He would often break out into snatches of song, comic or serious, or repeat whole scenes out of the "Olympic Devils," a burlesque performed at the Olympic Theatre, which had a great run in those days. His fine voice and his great love of music were expressive of the joviality of his nature. Things serious and profane lay near together in his mind, but they were not confused; he was never in the least degree either coarse or profane, though he might sometimes be misunderstood by persons who do not themselves understand a jest. I admit, however, that he was not indisposed to startle those who were of a different temper from his own—he had a sort of pleasure in doing so. He once took me, on a Sunday evening, in the middle of summer, about the year 1839, when his change of opinions was still recent, to Mr. Newman's church at Littlemore, where he was to preach. We drove out after dinner and walked home. Two things I remember on that occasion which were highly characteristic of him. The sermon which he preached was a printed one of Dr. Arnold's, but with additions and alterations which, as he said, it would have driven the author mad to hear. This indeed was true, for the intention of them was to change the spirit of the discourse from Low or Broad to High

Church, retaining what was common to both. We walked back to Oxford in the twilight, along the Iffley Road. He was in high spirits, and sang to me songs out of "Don Giovanni" and other operas, with which his capacious memory was well stored. He was not the less serious because he could pass an hour or two in this way.

As some of your readers may wish to know what manner of man he was in personal appearance, I will endeavour to describe him. He was about five feet nine in height, dark, but of a cheerful and handsome countenance, readily breaking out into a smile, ungainly in his movements, and uncommonly stout for his age. He was very disorderly both in his dress and his apartments. The tables in his room, never well furnished, were covered with books, pamphlets, papers, tea things, writing materials, etc. Once or twice he made an attempt, like other disorderly persons, to clear his Augean stable, but it only resulted in sending to the binder a few loose books and papers which were bound up together without regard to their subjects, and labelled "*Sermons, Operas, etc.*" These labels were declared by one of his friends to be symbolical of himself.

I cannot say that he was a good College tutor, though greatly interested in the welfare of the College, for he had no method. Once he was believed to have "sported his oak" when expecting a class. The attendance, as may easily be believed, speedily grew thinner, and the undergraduates learned to "sport the oak" for themselves. He was, for a time, Bursar of the College,—an office which, in those days, was handed on from Fellow to Fellow without any regard to the fitness of the holder. Your father was not a man of business, and he was not very successful in his administration of the college revenues. At the end of his two years, he was surprised to find that he was credited with a surplus of several hundred pounds, but the surplus was afterwards turned into a deficit by the discovery that he had added up the arrears on the wrong side of the page. No one was more amused at the mistake than he was himself. He, however, did something to atone for the error by the admirable manner in which he presided at the bursar's dinner.

I will leave others to speak of the great scene in the theatre when he was deprived of his degree. He made an impressive, though hastily prepared speech, by special permission of the Chancellor, in English, but the conciliation of his opponents was far from his thoughts. We know the sequel. Nor will I dilate upon another curious scene which occurred in the College chapel, on the day of St. Simon and St. Jude, when the Master, with your father, had gone up to the communion-table,—the latter, according to custom, intending to read the Epistle for the day. But the Master, who wanted to prevent his officiating, was too quick for

him, and had the satisfaction of himself reading, with much unction, the words, "For there are certain men crept in unawares who were before of old ordained unto this condemnation." The Master was anxious to deprive your father of his logical and mathematical lectureships; it was not so much to his tenure of the mathematical as of the logical to which he professed to object. "For," said he, "what heresy may not be insinuated in the form of a syllogism?" But it was difficult to dislodge him, for he was supported by a majority of the Fellows, and the Master was afraid to proceed. Your father, however, gave him an agreeable surprise by going to him one morning after chapel and saying, in his lively way, "Master, I am come to resign into your hands my two lectureships." Nothing more was said; a weight had been removed from the bosom of both of them, and they talked merrily together.

But I must make your readers understand that in this assemblage of pleasant qualities there was also an admixture of seriousness which formed the basis of his character. I approach this part of the subject with diffidence, because, being an outsider, I may not have understood all his motives and feelings, though he was very willing to impart them, and I may seem to intrude too much on his private life. I think he was led to join the Roman Catholic Church chiefly for two reasons—(1) by a logical necessity, because such a step seemed to be the natural conclusion of premises which he had held for many years, and in favour of which he had always been arguing with himself. (2) But he had also another feeling. For the world, and especially for himself, there seemed to him to be a need of some authority to which they could resign themselves unreservedly. He had never had any hope of finding the way of truth or of life through philosophy, and the want of some guide was a practical necessity to him, without which he could neither have clearness of thought nor consistency in action. There was more than this, no doubt. There were thoughts and feelings too deep to be spoken of. I do not suppose that he ever hesitated for an instant about the great change which he made in his life, or that he ever repented having made it. Only we used to observe that, after he became a Roman Catholic, he would speak in a more friendly and respectful manner of the Church of England than he used to do while he continued in her communion, and in a less enthusiastic manner of the Church of Rome. Not unfrequently in conversation he would draw comparisons between the two Churches favourable to the Church of England, especially in reference to learning and education. And his expressions were stronger than was quite agreeable to his Catholic superiors. He told me that he had said to Cardinal Wiseman: "When a Protestant meets a Catholic in controversy, it is like a civilised man meeting a barbarian;" and the Cardinal was

naturally a little put out by this remark. But it was your father's habit to say anything that came into his head.

He was eminently English in his straightforwardness and independence of character. His opinions on political and social subjects were hardly, if at all, affected by his Catholicism. A friend, pushing matters a little too far, once asked him what part he would have taken had he been living in the days of the Spanish Armada; he could only reply that Queen Elizabeth was excommunicated. But from such contradictions of faith and patriotism he generally found a way of escape. Having, as he entirely believed, an indestructible basis of truth in the doctrines of the Church, he could afford to view all secular matters in the light of reason and experience.

With German philosophy he had little acquaintance. In the days of which I am speaking, the speculative system which interested him most was Comte's *Philosophie Positive*, at that time appearing in a new series of volumes, to which he was greatly attracted. The charm which this remarkable work exercised over him was probably due to Comte's high estimate of the Middle Ages, and the many other superficial resemblances which occur in the system to the institutions, and even to the doctrines of the Catholic Church. He introduced the book into Oxford before it was known to those who were afterwards called Comtists. Another writer for whom he had a great respect was John Stuart Mill. He admired his clearness and high principle. In those days,—I am speaking chiefly of the years between 1840 and 1844,—we used to argue a good deal on subjects of theology and philosophy. The last time I saw him, he reminded me that I charged him with "shallow logic" and that he retorted on me with "misty metaphysics." This perhaps was not an unfair account of the state of the controversy between us. I remember his finishing up one of our arguments by saying that "the Roman Catholic Church was not more rigid in her definitions of truth than the Protestant, but that she believed more truths to have been revealed."

He was fond of stating his views in a pointed form. It was he who invented the expression "taking the Articles in a non-natural sense," which afterwards became proverbial; and at one time he used to say that in subscribing to them "we were not all dishonest together, but all honest together." I asked him why the leaders of the Tractarian Movement, instead of explaining away the Articles by casuistical distinctions, did not, like Dean Stanley and others, rather contend for their being interpreted in a large and liberal manner, or press for their abolition. He replied that such a mode of dealing with them had been considered, but was thought to give too great an encouragement to Rationalism. About two years before he joined the Church of Rome he bid me observe that "of late he

had ceased to speak with me on theological subjects, because I seemed to think that there might be some important sense in which Christianity was true, apart from the certainty of historical facts."

When I last saw him, in the Isle of Wight, I asked him whether he thought there was any hope of a great Catholic revival, and in what way it might be effected. The answer was curious. He said "Yes!" and he thought that the change would be brought about, (1) by a great outpouring of miraculous power in many parts of the world; (2) by the rise of a new Catholic philosophy, for which portions of Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent* would form a fitting basis.

All my personal recollections of your father are of the pleasantest kind. He was generous, considerate, affectionate, and rarely, if ever, he was divided from any one by difference of opinion. He remarked to me once how well he and Scott (Dean of Rochester) and Tait (Archbishop of Canterbury) got on together, because they were all equally in earnest about their duties to the College. His head was perhaps a little turned by the extraordinary position in which he found himself when not yet thirty years of age. His life, while a Fellow, was a remarkably happy one. He had no pleasing recollections of childhood. He told me that he was happier at college than at school; happier as a Fellow than as an undergraduate; and the years were the happiest of all during which he was teaching theology at Ware.

It has been a pleasure to me to be reminded of old times, to recall many ancient kindnesses, and to acknowledge the intellectual obligations which I owe to your father. Few persons in our time have exerted a greater influence on their contemporaries than he did at Oxford when he was quite a young man. This influence was due quite as much to the kindness and large-heartedness of his nature, as to the charm of his conversation and his great dialectical powers.

An old friend of your father's, Lord Coleridge, who has read the preceding remarks, thinks that I have not dwelt enough on the jovial or festive side of his nature. I will add a few words on this part of the subject. I have already said he was full of mirth and jollity; even when in pain, he was ready to laugh and make others laugh all day long. His sayings and doings were in the mouth of every one; and, as I have compared him to Socrates in his dialectical powers, I would add that he was like Falstaff in his love of making fun. It will be understood that neither of these comparisons is to be taken quite literally. He was also "of a most noble presence;" and his laughter, if the Johnsonian test be applied to him, was "by no means contemptible." I hope that Lord Coleridge will think that the omission of which he complains is now supplied.

—Yours very sincerely, B. JOWETT.

## APPENDIX E

The following extracts from Tract 90 give a general idea of the modes of interpretation which it advocated—which Mr. Ward styled "subscribing the Articles in a *non-natural* sense":—

"Article XXI.—General councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes, and when they be gathered together, forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, in things pertaining to God."

That great bodies of men, of different countries, may not meet together without the sanction of their rulers, is plain from the principles of civil obedience and from primitive practice. That, when met together, though Christians, they will not be all ruled by the Spirit or Word of God, is plain from our Lord's parable of the net, and from melancholy experience. That bodies of men, deficient in this respect, may err, is a self-evident truth,—*unless*, indeed, they be favoured with some divine superintendence, which has to be proved before it can be admitted. General councils, then, may err (*as such*;—may err), *unless* in any case it is promised, as a matter of express supernatural privilege, that they shall *not* err; a case which lies beyond the scope of this Article, or at any rate beside its determination.

Such a promise, however, *does* exist, in cases when general councils are not only gathered together according to "the commandment and will of princes," but *in the name of Christ*, according to our Lord's promise. The Article merely contemplates the human prince, not the King of Saints. While councils are a thing of earth, their infallibility of course is not guaranteed; when they are a thing of heaven, their deliberations are overruled, and their decrees authoritative. In such cases they are *Catholic* councils.

. . . . . .

"Article XXII.—The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons (de indulgentiis), worshipping (de veneratione), and adoration, as well of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing (res est futilis) vainly (inaniter) invented, and grounded

upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant (contradicit) to the Word of God. . . ."

By "the Romish doctrine" is not meant the Tridentine [statement], because this Article was drawn up before the decree of the Council of Trent. What is opposed is the *received doctrine* of the day, and unhappily of this day too, or the doctrine of the *Roman schools;* a conclusion which is still more clear, by considering that there are portions in the Tridentine [statements] on these subjects, which the Article, far from condemning, by anticipation approves, as far as they go. For instance, the Decree of Trent enjoins concerning purgatory thus:—"Among the uneducated vulgar let *difficult and subtle questions*, which make not for edification, and seldom contribute aught towards piety, be kept back from popular discourses. Neither let them suffer the public mention and treatment of *uncertain points*, or such as *look like falsehood.*"—Session 25. Again about images: *Due* honour and veneration is to be paid unto them, *not that we believe that any divinity or virtue is in them*, for which they should be worshipped (colendæ), or that *we should ask anything* of them, or that trust should be reposed in images, as formerly was done by the Gentiles, which used to place their hope on idols . . ."—*Ibid.*

The doctrine . . . of pardons, spoken of in the Article, is the doctrine maintained and acted on in the Roman Church, that remission of the penalties of sin in the next life may be obtained by the power of the Pope, with such abuses as money payments consequent thereupon. . . . On the whole, then, by the Romish doctrine of the veneration and worshipping of images and relics, the Article means all maintenance of those idolatrous honours which have been and are paid them so commonly throughout the Church of Rome, with the superstitions, profanities, and impurities consequent thereupon. . . .

"Article XXXI.—The sacrifice (sacrificia) of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits (perniciosæ imposturæ)."

Nothing can show more clearly than this passage that the Articles are not written against the creed of the Roman Church, but against actual existing errors in it, whether taken into its system or not. Here the sacrifice of the *Mass* is not spoken of, in which the special question of doctrine would be introduced; but "the sacrifice of *Masses*," certain observances, for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past, and saw before their eyes, and which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching. Accordingly the passage proceeds, "in which it *was commonly said*," which surely is a strictly historical mode of speaking.

## APPENDIX F

THE following are some of the passages to which Cardinal Newman has referred me, which describe, he says, Mr. Ward's line in the Movement:—

"While my old and true friends were thus in trouble about me, I suppose they felt not only anxiety, but pain, to see that I was gradually surrendering myself to the influence of others, who had not their own claims upon me, younger men, and of a cast of mind in no small degree uncongenial to my own. A new school of thought was rising, as is usual in doctrinal inquiries, and was sweeping the original party of the Movement aside, and was taking its place."

He then speaks of Mr. Oakeley, who, though he ceased to reside at Oxford in 1839, was, at the outset, the member of the new school whose University standing was highest. He was older than the others, and, according to the Cardinal, more nearly resembled the original Tractarian party in tone of mind. The typical members of the new school are thus described:—

"That body of eager, acute, resolute minds who had begun their Catholic life about the same time as [Oakeley], who knew nothing about the *via media*, but had heard much about Rome. This new party rapidly formed and increased, in and out of Oxford, and, as it so happened, contemporaneously with that very summer, when I received so serious a blow to my ecclesiastical views from the study of the monophysite controversy. These men cut into the original Movement at an angle, fell across its line of thought, and then set about turning that line in its own direction. They were most of them keenly religious men, with a true concern for their souls as the first matter of all, with a great zeal for me, but giving little certainty at the time as to which way they would ultimately turn.

. . . . . .

"Though I neither was so fond (with a few exceptions) of the persons, nor of the methods of thought, which belonged to this new school, as of the old set, though I could not trust in their firmness of purpose, for, like a swarm of flies, they might come and go, and at length be divided and dissipated, yet I had an intense sympathy in their object, and in the direc-

tion in which their path lay, in spite of my old friends, in spite of my old life-long prejudices. In spite of my ingrained fears of Rome, and the decision of my reason and conscience against her usages, in spite of my affection for Oxford and Oriel, yet I had a secret longing love of Rome, the mother of English Christianity, and I had a true devotion to the Blessed Virgin, in whose College I lived, whose Altar I served, and whose Immaculate Purity I had in one of my earliest printed sermons made much of. And it was the consciousness of this bias in myself, if it is so to be called, which made me preach so earnestly against the danger of being swayed in religious inquiry by our sympathy rather than by our reason. And, moreover, the members of this new school looked up to me, as I have said, and did me true kindnesses, and really loved me, and stood by me in trouble, when others went away, and for all this I was grateful; nay, many of them were in trouble themselves, and in the same boat with me, and that was a further cause of sympathy between us; and hence it was, when the new school came on in force, and into collision with the old, I had not the heart, any more than the power, to repel them; I was in great perplexity, and hardly knew where I stood; I took their part; and, when I wanted to be in peace and silence, I had to speak out, and I incurred the charge of weakness from some men, and of mysteriousness, shuffling, and underhand dealing from the majority."

In the following passage we have, apparently, the Cardinal's own feeling at the time when on the one hand his enemies accused him of disingenuousness, and on the other Ward attempted to force his hand, and pressed for fuller statements than he chose to give :—

"I simply deny that I ever said anything which secretly bore against the Church of England, knowing it myself, in order that others might unwarily accept it. It was indeed one of my great difficulties and causes of reserve, as time went on, that I at length recognised in principles, which I had honestly preached as an Anglican, conclusions favourable to the cause of Rome. Of course, I did not like to confess this; and, when interrogated, was in consequence in perplexity. The prime instance of this was the appeal to antiquity; St. Leo had overset, in my own judgment, its force as the special argument for Anglicanism; yet I was committed to antiquity, together with the whole Anglican school; what then was I to say, when acute minds urged this or that application of it against the *via media?* It was impossible that, in such circumstances, any answer could be given which was not unsatisfactory, or any behaviour adopted which was not mysterious. Again, sometimes in what I wrote I went just as far as I saw, and could as little say more, as I could see what is below the horizon; and therefore, when asked as to the consequences of what I had said, I had no answer to give. Again, sometimes when I was asked whether certain conclusions did not follow from a certain principle, I might not be able to tell at the moment, especially if the matter were complicated; and for this reason, if for no other, because there is great difference between a conclusion in the abstract and a conclusion in the concrete, and because a conclusion may be modified in fact by a conclusion from some opposite principle. Or it might so happen

that my head got simply confused, by the very strength of the logic which was administered to me, and thus I gave my sanction to conclusions which really were not mine; and when the report of those conclusions came round to me through others, I had to unsay them. And then, again, perhaps I did not like to see men scared or scandalised by unfeeling logical inferences, which would not have troubled them to the day of their death, had they not been forced to recognise them."

In the following extracts we seem to have a still plainer reference to the contrast already referred to in the text between Ward's love for the logical and dialectical method and Newman's very different temper of mind:—

"To come to me with methods of logic had in it the nature of a provocation, and though I do not think I ever showed it, made me somewhat indifferent how I met them, and perhaps led me, as a means of relieving my impatience, to be mysterious or irrelevant, or to give in because I could not meet them to my satisfaction. And a greater trouble still than these logical mazes was the introduction of logic into every subject whatever, so far, that is, as this was done. . . . One is not always pleased when poetry, or eloquence, or devotion, is considered as if chiefly intended to feed syllogisms. Now, in saying all this, I am saying nothing against the deep piety and earnestness which were characteristics of this second phase of the Movement, in which I had taken so prominent a part. What I have been observing is, that this phase had a tendency to bewilder and to upset me; and that, instead of saying so, as I ought to have done, perhaps from a sort of laziness I gave answers at random, which have led to my appearing close or inconsistent."

The following letter, already quoted in the text, should be read again in this connection. It is given in the *Apologia* as an illustration of the state of mind described in the above extracts:—

"16*th October* 1842.—As to my being entirely with Ward, I do not know the limits of my own opinions. If Ward says that this or that is a development from what I have said, I cannot say yes or no. It is plausible, it *may* be true. Of course the fact that the Roman Church *has* so developed and maintained adds great weight to the antecedent plausibility. I cannot assert that it is not true, but I cannot, with that keen perception which some people have, appropriate it. It is a nuisance to me to be *forced* beyond what I can fairly accept."

# APPENDIX G

THE following extracts from the *Ideal of a Christian Church* are illustrations of points which have been touched on in the analysis of that work in Chapter XI. They give—in the author's own words—certain lines of thought, indispensable to the understanding of his intellectual position.

The first set of extracts have reference to his view that the only office of the external framework of a Church is to protect and foster a certain inward ethical spirit—consequently that framework may within limits vary in different countries, being to some extent modified by peculiarities of national character and customs. Further, the spirit in question is only the fuller development of the first lessons of natural religion in the human conscience—of the idea of an external law imposed on our obedience by a righteous power above us, and of the nature of that law. The law receives, however, fresh sanctions in the truths of Revelation, its nature is more clearly defined, and new strength is given by the ordinances of the Church for its practical fulfilment.

Again, while the Church uniformly protects and develops the natural law, heresies have from time to time introduced into Christianity doctrines contrary to natural religion—as when Lutheranism has obscured or denied the intrinsic moral worth of obedience to conscience. Lastly, in the practical carrying out of the Lutheran spirit we see a religion of feeling taking the place of that of duty, and trust in subjective feelings taking the place of obedience to a law—which, though revealed *within* the heart, yet bears its own evidence that it is not purely subjective, but is the creation and reflection of an external Power.

"The only legitimate office of the external framework and constitution of a Church is to be, first, the expression, mould, and protection of a certain given religious spirit: and, secondly, the mode by which this spirit is brought to bear upon a certain given condition of society; to pay any serious regard to it, on any other principles, is the certain road to the hollowest and most hideous formalism. First, then, let us endeavour to secure what *comes* first; let us learn, to the best of our power, to

understand and appreciate the various exigencies, tendencies, tastes, capabilities of the modern English character; and in proportion as we succeed in our attempts, by help of such knowledge, to promote and forward the growth of this same Catholic spirit, the latter will clothe itself in whatever external envelopment may be found ready at hand, which it will quicken, enliven, and re-create, adopting it as the organ of its expression and the minister of its will. What outward shape this envelopment will ultimately assume, in what degree Catholicism will modify our existing institutions, in what degree it will itself receive a colour *from* those institutions, and from our national character and dispositions; all this, and much more of the same kind, it is vain and useless to conjecture before the event. Catholicism is something moral and spiritual, not formal, external, circumstantial; in doctrine, in sentiment, in principle, ever one and the same; but elastic and pliant to adapt itself to all conceivable circumstances, vigorous and full of life to cope with all conceivable emergencies. Take the case of an individual, whose religion shall assume a more earnest or more orthodox character: we do not find that his recognisable identity of *mind* is affected, any more than of *body*. His numberless peculiarities of feeling and disposition, taste and imagination, intellectual cultivation and power, still remain undiminished in their native distinctness and energy: although at the same time a new and authoritative element has been introduced, which, to an illimitably increasing extent, controls, harmonises, and colours those peculiarities. Let a number of serious and Catholic-minded men meet together; how very far will they be from exhibiting any artificial conformity to some external and partial standard; and yet for all this, a like-minded observer will very easily discern, by means of indications far too 'subtle, delicate, indirect, and spiritual,' to admit of analysis and formal expression, the essential oneness of principle, which animates and informs those accidental diversities of character. What then would be thought of some disciple in the school, who, being desirous of conforming more fully to the Catholic model, should copy the expressions and gestures, or even the argumentative methods and political opinions, of some one amongst their number, instead of attempting, by legitimate means, to lodge more deeply within his heart that essential principle which is common to them all? The application of this, from individuals to societies, is obvious."—(*Ideal*, pp. 83-85).

Again, speaking of the spirit of absolute submission in the details of life to the will of God as a prominent feature in Catholic life, he writes:—

"This feature of the Catholic character is merely a conformity with the first principles of natural religion and morality; to disparage it is to blaspheme against those eternal and immutable principles. It is not that Catholics consider this feature essential, because they believe that a strict judgment is to come; but, on the contrary, God has revealed a strict judgment to come, that our frail nature may be supported in its efforts to attain what conscience proclaims as essential. These efforts do not become a duty, because God has ordered us to fear; but God has ordered us to fear, because these efforts are in themselves a duty."—(p. 218).

Again, he explains the practical bearing of Revealed Truth on the duty of obedience to conscience — first taught by natural religion—as follows :—

"It is an eternal and irreversible truth of natural religion, that beings whose will is not as yet wholly subordinate to the rule of right and the will of God, have this one paramount duty imposed on them before all other duties, viz., to exercise themselves in obedience to the voice of conscience, by unceasing efforts to reduce their will into a fuller and more complete subjection. The form which this eternal truth assumes under the pure Gospel is very much as follows. Converts to Christianity, at their baptism, by faith are justified; by faith receive pardon for their past sins; by faith are endued with a most precious inward gift, and are brought into new relations, into a new sphere of unseen agencies. Then begins a new course of solemn trial and conflict, far more solemn indeed than any they can have hitherto known; a trial which so closely concerns them, that on their behaviour during its progress depends nothing less than their everlasting destiny; and that trial is no other than this, how carefully and watchfully they shall retain that faith which now is theirs, and to how great an extent, by following zealously their sense of duty, they shall engraft on it the habit of love. And whereas, although nothing can be more distinct than the conscience's *claim* to obedience, few things are more feeble than its power of *enforcing* it; whereas its very voice is instantaneously overwhelmed by the impetuous irruption of present impulses and inclinations; and whereas the resistance of corrupt human nature to that discipline and restraint, which is indispensably requisite for the continual improvement required of us, is most unceasing, energetic, and obdurate; the Gospel directs its most powerful motives, collected as it were from all quarters, to the strengthening of this one faculty, which is so peculiarly in need of strength." —(pp. 213, 214).

With respect to the taint of Lutheranism to be found in the Establishment, and the consequent disparagement of the necessity, under the Gospel dispensation, of painstaking watchfulness, he writes :—

"Now a little consideration will show us that the vitally fundamental truth, which Lutheranism formally denies, is, to say the least, disparaged and most inadequately apprehended by very many, who cannot with any justice be ranked in the 'Evangelical' party. There are indeed, I fear, comparatively few among us who do not consciously or unconsciously entertain the idea that habitual and laborious watchfulness; the painful effort to change our will and purify our hearts by exercising ourselves day by day in the events of ordinary life as they occur; the humbling ourselves and doing penance in remembrance of our past sins, one by one; the labouring constantly to keep before our mind the thought of Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell; that all this is at least not *so* imperatively required under Christianity as under natural religion. Whereas in truth the peculiarity of Christ's religion is not that, in any the smallest particular, it dispenses with the obligation to obedience (a righteous God

*cannot* dispense with that obligation), but that it gives most wonderful and unprecedented help towards *carrying out* obedience; and since 'to whom much is given, from him will much be required,' it follows that the amount of obedience which God demands at our hands is so much the greater, by how much Christian gifts are more wonderful and transcendent. This it is, I say, which all the various heretical parties within our Church in one way or other disparage, and which I heartily wish that even the more orthodox in general more fully realised. Men speak as though, in some sense at least and in some degree, the Gospel were a *reversal* of the natural law, instead of being solely and exclusively its *complement*. And I would beg of my readers to pay particular attention to this statement; because it is the very central point of that view of our present circumstances, which it is the object of this work to submit with deep deference to my brethren. And it is because this truth seems to me so all-important at the present time, and the Lutheran doctrine of Justification is that particular heresy which plainly and in terms denies it, that I have felt bound from time to time in the *British Critic* to protest so emphatically, and in language of such unbounded and indignant reprobation, against that doctrine."—(pp. 247, 248).

Of the work of the Church, as in helping men to fulfil the natural law, so in witnessing its practical applications and reprobating all teaching which is opposed to it, he writes:—

"And as it is with the duties of natural religion, so it is also with the precepts correlative to those duties. If consistently obedient men be the fountains from which moral truth flows to the world, and if, without special grace, consistent obedience be unattainable, we shall be prepared to expect what in fact we find, how miserably inadequate was that knowledge and perception of the eternal law of God which was generally diffused before Christian times. It is not till the first promulgation of *the Gospel* that we find among men in general any tolerable appreciation of *the Law;* but from that period downwards we find that which was before but hypothesis and capability converted into actual achievements, into living and energising results. For eighteen centuries and upwards has the Church faithfully witnessed the great truths of morality and natural religion in their full circle, whether against Manichæan heretics in earlier, or Lutheran in later, times. She has drawn out the scientific statement of God's nature; she has proclaimed and enforced the various holy tempers required by the natural law, explored the theory of their mutual relations and dependency, discussed the mode of their application to the outward state of things at each succeeding period of her progress, and provided her children with invaluable help and support for their attainment; all this she has done with a confidence, completeness, depth, and illumination of view, so absolutely beyond comparison with any feeble efforts in that direction which may have existed in heathen times, as most fully to justify Bishop Butler's remark, that it would be difficult for us adequately to appreciate the blessings we have obtained through the Gospel, even without reference made to the information and gifts peculiar to itself."—(pp. 253, 254).

peaking again of the Lutheran spirit of passivity—with its con-ant elements of "cant" and sentimentality—in its practical estation, he says:—

As to . . . sins, such as envy, sloth, discontent, passionateness, and e, there is every reason to believe that an upholder of this principle ften confess to himself that they have command over his mind in no ry degree; and that after a lapse of time the same confession will eated; and yet, though he does not even fancy himself to have any real or serious attempt in the interval, by God's help, to subdue he will experience no deep repentance in that no such attempt has made, but rather a certain confident self-complacency, as though ere consciousness of their existence, and a sentimental sigh breathed heir sinfulness, were a full proof of the spiritual mind, and a full nce of security against future judgment."—(pp. 220, 221).

f the narrowness and fanaticism which come from the neglect one principle of spiritual illumination—laborious obedience science—he speaks thus:—

And what is the result of this most monstrous and fanatical notion? ultivation of conscience is indissolubly bound up with self-denial, if not even the same thing in another shape; self-denial is of all ses the most repugnant to man's fallen and corrupt nature; ore if this duty be not enforced with the most urgent, energetic, and ed appeals, it will, by inevitable consequence, either be performed utter inadequacy or wholly neglected. The voice of conscience, being thus allowed to remain dormant, is confused, without possi- of distinction, with the caprice of imagination, or with individual arities and associations. Hence it follows, that those who (like, I se, most 'Evangelicals' and Protestant Dissenters) regard themselves as l with some personal divine illumination, are led to look upon even narrowest prejudices or absurdest imaginations as the very dictate Holy Ghost; to look upon themselves and the few whose prejudices eculiarities agree with their own, as the fountains of divine truth; t their eyes to the plainest marks of sanctity in those who abhor lenounce their 'cant' phrases; and to regard with a compassion y bordering on contempt us ordinary men, who earnestly disclaim ch personal illumination in ourselves, and refuse to recognise it in '—(p. 261).

he next set of extracts have reference to the contrast between rely intellectual and external view of Catholicism—however d and fair—on the one hand; and the view, on the other hand, e who approaches the study of religion from within:—the l points for admiration, the standard by which achievement is ured, and the perception of its whole ethical side, being entirely ent in the two. In proportion as a student is within *any* religious system, he is in a position to judge in some degree tholicism, as Catholicism embraces what is best in all systems.

But one who is external to all existing systems is necessarily blind to the *criterion* of religious truth. "The glory of the king's daughter is within," and one who does not see or understand the inherent nobility of much that is externally insignificant, however fair and candid, has not the requisite materials present to his judgment for understanding the Catholic Church.

Speaking of an inquirer who takes up a purely external position, he writes:—

"I think, in fact, that a student of able and enlarged mind, and endued with great intellectual ardour, who should be mad enough and miserable enough to seek for truth by taking up a position external to all existing systems, rather than by humbly and diligently working in that where God has placed him, till his conscience shall tell him to advance from it, that such an one would see much in Catholicism attractive to him in the same sense in which worldly systems attract him. 'Evangelicalism,' or ordinary 'Anglicanism,' he would altogether put aside; for he would not understand the moral persuasiveness exhibited by those respective schemes to persons trained in them, while he would see very plainly their utter theoretical baselessness and incoherency. But in Catholicism he would see a wonderful harmony of parts, depth of view, and consistency of progress; he would fairly recognise it as the majestic and wonderful development of a real idea; and he would acknowledge in it a surprising suitableness to human nature under certain aspects; he would see, moreover, how plausible an account it gives of a vast number of external facts, which it is at first sight difficult otherwise to understand; and again, in an æsthetical point of view, he would do justice to its great, and perhaps unapproached, excellence. Such truths as these, unbelievers and misbelievers of the present day, unless grossly narrow-minded and uncandid, fully admit. But notwithstanding, he would consider himself to see in Catholicism a certain want of enlargement and comprehensiveness; a certain formalism, stiffness, and absence of elasticity; an incapability of adapting itself to circumstances; an excessive regard of detail; nay, still more than this, a something, which would even excite his contempt, as imbecile, superstitious, and anile."—(pp. 268, 269).

Again, he pursues the contrast between the everyday maxims and standards of the candid man of the world and the utterly different ones which form the essence of Christian life and judgment:—

"First, the sacred and essential truth is cherished and displayed in every detail of the Catholic system, of the infinite superiority of moral over intellectual greatness; the truth, that one temptation to evil consistently overcome, through God's grace, by the humblest Christian, is an infinitely nobler object of contemplation than the most brilliant theories, or the most wonderful generalisations and deductions. Now, a Christian who, to the most enlarged mind and profoundest wisdom, should superadd the possession, so infinitely more precious, of a tender and watchful conscience, causes in the mind of a candid observer, who may happen not

to sympathise with this latter, a peculiar admixture of surprise and contempt with whatever there may be of admiration. Such a Christian appears, after having proposed to himself the most exalted and comprehensive designs, to be restrained by weak and superstitious scruples from measures which are necessary to follow them out. Or he will neglect their prosecution at an important moment from the call of duty, or, as it will appear to those not understanding such a call, from the mere effect of feebleness of mind and religious caprice. Or his habitual trust in the aid of Providence, and anxious dependence on slight intimations of God's pleasure, will produce an effect which looks like deficiency in the power of pursuing a continued and well-planned course of action. Or even without reference to its bearing on political exertion, the continual check on the free course of thought and conversation, caused by habitual watchfulness against sin, *e.g.*, against anything approaching to slander or profaneness, appears to 'them that are without' stiff and pusillanimous. Again, the love and desire of suffering, to which a very sensitive conscience infallibly leads—the hair-shirt, or self-inflicted stripes, or long fasts—if they do not appear most admirable and excellent, appear childish and superstitious."—(pp. 271, etc.)

Again, he insists on the fact that all religious affections being centred in the Infinite God Incarnate, their manifestations are exhibitions of the grand principle of Christian action. This gives significance and value to little external acts by which they are fostered or expressed—as the preservation of relics, the reverence for memorial statues. The man of the world, on the other hand, makes light of affections and dispositions. To him such acts appear trivial, because he has no vision of the importance and nobility of the life of the soul. Secret virtues and secret faults are to him alike unimportant. The gaze of man is his ultimate appeal, for he has lost sight of Him who "seeth in secret":—

"Now, supposing hypothetically for a moment (what is the very contrary of the truth) that such peculiarities and tendencies [as cherishing images or relics] implied any the slightest weakness of mind, even then we know how great a part of the interest of life in worldly men, whose minds and affections are at all elevated above the herd, arises from the indulgence of such feelings; nor is it obvious, *e.g.*, why to kiss fondly a mother's portrait or lock of hair is more manly than to cherish and bear about a crucifix or a fragment of the true cross. And the contrast becomes much greater, when we consider the common herd of irreligious men; for surely the taking of pains to secure the comforts of everyday life, the being solicitous about the cooking of our dinner, the finding it difficult to refrain from unwholesome indulgence in the article of food, the greediness of present praise or posthumous renown, the powerlessness of commanding our temper in the little minor miseries of life, the difficulty of bearing sickness cheerfully, and a thousand similar weaknesses, to which in various measures most of us, I suppose, must plead guilty, and to which certainly very eminent philosophers and mathematicians have

been in subjection, but from which saintly men are eminently emancipated, all these are surely, on any possible view of things, incomparably lower and more contemptible than even what some might call a superstitious regard to sacred relics or images. But then human philosophy, being, as I have said, unpractical and imaginative, puts aside from our view this degrading aspect of human nature; it represents its heroes as the ideal personifications of intellectual power or artistical grace. Here, then, we see great cause for the ridiculous mistakes continually committed by the Protestant or man of the world, in judging the great luminaries of the Church. In their case human affections and emotions, indefinitely purified and exalted, and fixed on a Heavenly Object, are the very vital principle of their conduct. This it is which gives unity to their life, whether speculative or active; the earnest habitual devotion of their whole heart and soul, not to some abstract principle, but to a Living Person, and for His sake to those most dear to Him. Those mental habits, then, and external practices, to which, in the case of worldly heroes, philosophers shut their eyes, that they may gaze on what appears to the carnal perception more great, splendid, and glorious, these cannot be removed from public sight in the Church of Christ, but are then most prominently displayed and most zealously defended, when the most arduous conflicts are to be waged, or the most noble deeds to be done. To be ashamed of devotion to the Blessed Saints, or to the relics of their earthly tabernacles, or to holy images, is to be ashamed of the Cross of Christ, and to lower the standard of high and heavenly philosophy before the supercilious, specious, empty philosophy of the world. For by so doing, we shrink from publicly professing the great Christian truth, that ardent personal love for Christ, whose friends those saints are, who has dwelt by the agency of the Holy Ghost within those earthly tabernacles, and who is Himself represented in those images, that this ardent personal love for Him is the very centre of all true philosophy, and, as from an eminence, commands all the powers of our intellect and imagination submissively to bend before it and do its bidding. These are, I think, the principal reasons of the certain fact that 'Christ crucified,' as preached by the Church, is in great measure 'foolishness' to the philosophical world now, as it was in the first ages of the Gospel; and that men of high aspirations and capabilities, if undisciplined and unchastened, will be far more readily attracted by the dazzling brilliancy of human philosophies than by the severe and unearthly grace of the Bride of the Lamb. I have said, as in the first ages, but I should rather say incomparably more than in the first ages; for, in this as in very many other particulars, there is even a marked contrast between this and the primitive period on the very matter in hand, on the respective position of the Church and those that are without; a contrast which gives much greater force to the argument. Then human philosophies were effete, unattractive, 'waxen old,' while the Church came forth, as it were, unto an unoccupied arena, promising to 'declare Him whom they ignorantly worshipped;' but now, while the Church has to bear the responsibility of all the assailable points in her past history, which must of necessity have arisen from her long and close proximity to the world, human systems have come out new and glittering, and as it were with the gloss on them; which, as being the *products* of

the age, have a natural suitableness and promise of satisfaction at least to the more obvious and superficial *requirements* of the age."—(pp. 273-275).

The belief—ever preached and never in practice realised—that the souls of the poor may have all the spiritual refinement, delicacy of religious experience, depth of religious feeling, perfection of Christian advancement, of which the educated are capable, is insisted on with some of its easily forgotten consequences and corollaries :—

"Now let us fairly ask ourselves the question. Have we ever realised the fact, or when we look at the poor as we find them around us can we by ever so great an effort bring ourselves to realise the fact, that the Mother of God, the holy Apostles, the great body of early Christians, belonged to the same class with our agricultural and manufacturing poor? Would it not involve a revolution in all our habits of thought, fully to believe that those devoted to lifelong manual labour may contemplate heavenly things as habitually, desire spiritual blessings as earnestly, and despise earthly joys or sorrows as triumphantly, as the most educated of us all? Would it not be our immediate tendency to ridicule the idea of a man with rough hands, soiled dress, and homely speech, oppressed with bitter sorrow for some deficiency in the hearty performance of the labour covenanted with his employer, or for some one discontented or angry thought, or seriously complaining of the aridity which he from time to time experiences in prayer and meditation? Yet such is the account we over and over again read of saints or saintly men in the Catholic Church. How deeply and fundamentally opposed, then, are our habits and tendencies to that Scriptural standard, which Protestants *profess* to follow, but to which the Church Catholic alone has faithfully witnessed."—(pp. 333-334).

I next quote a few from among the many indications that Mr. Ward foresaw the sceptical effects on English thought of the intellectual activity of which the Oxford Movement was one manifestation, and maintained — what has since become so generally acknowledged—that the nature of the human conscience was the crucial question in the coming controversy. If conscience is not in some sense a voice from above, natural theology is unsatisfying, and cannot withstand the assaults of its critics :—

"And let it not be supposed that this leaven [of scepticism] is not very widely working, and very rapidly spreading, because it has not yet appeared much on the surface ; the present state of the English mind, so unfavourable to all free and consecutive speculation, good or bad, accounts sufficiently for that ; and I cannot but fear that a wide experience will on the whole bear out the truth of what I am now saying. I believe that the unspeculative, common-sense, Procrustean spirit, which has hitherto governed English thought, is most certainly destined to fall, and is even now fast falling ; it may be succeeded by something far better, or by something far worse ; but it will certainly be succeeded by something very different from itself."—(p. 267).

Of the function of conscience as having alone among man's faculties *immediate* cognisance of supernatural truth, he writes :—

"Now I wish to put forward plainly and in the face of day this truth, which, *if conscience does not speak, we can neither apprehend the idea, nor have any ground for believing the existence of God Himself.* A very few words will suffice to show this. The idea of God has no archetype, either in the visible course of things whereof our senses give us experience, nor yet in the *a priori* field of space and time whereof alone the intellect is exclusively cognisant: we can neither derive the idea, then, from our intellect, nor from our senses, nor from any faculty which does not possess the power of putting us into communication with *realities and essences:* in other words, only from our consciences, for no other faculty even *professes* this power. It is accordingly acknowledged, I believe, by all philosophers at the present day with one voice, that the consideration of final causes is most edifying indeed to the religious believer, and most useful as a support to languishing faith, by exhibiting as it were a visible pledge of God's power and attributes; but that as a sufficient basis for Theism it is absolutely and completely worthless. This is very important; for vast multitudes are fruitlessly endeavouring to occupy some middle position, between granting all to conscience and denying all: yet is it so very plain, that, notwithstanding its great importance, I can find no words to make it plainer. Let me then repeat what I have said. If conscience be not on all moral and religious subjects paramount, then it does not really exist; if it do not exist, we have no reason whatever, nay, no power whatever, to believe in God.

"This, I have already said, is no mere theory. I was obliged, in writing an article on Mr. Mill's logic, to express a most serious doubt whether he could fairly be considered, from his system, to possess religious belief of any kind; and I certainly am not aware of any living English intellectual speculator, in a non-theological line, who appears to me at all Mr. Mill's equal in power and acquirements. Since I wrote that review I have read great part of a work which Mr. Mill cites with the warmest approbation, and without one word of qualification as to its religious tenets. I allude to M. Comte's *Cours de Philosophie Positive.* Here is to be found a series of plain, direct, and even earnest disavowals of Theism in all possible shapes, and the expression of a confident expectation that in a few centuries hence the very existence of any religious belief will only be known as a matter of history. Moreover, the very argument on which M. Comte grounds his Atheism is the one of which I have been speaking—the circumstance that (as he considers) we have no such faculty as a conscience. I hardly think that, under any circumstances, such views as these can ever obtain extensive reception, *naturam expellas*, etc.; and even M. Comte, very much more Mr. Mill, show plain marks that at last conscience is more than a match for them. But though firm and undoubting *disbelief* in the power of knowing God's existence may be always rare, I fear that a very extensive subversion of firm and undoubting *belief* in Him, that belief which alone can enable man for a continuance to resist the evil tendencies and temptations which assail him,—this, I fear, is very far from improbable; indeed it

seems to me the precise issue and consummation to which the course of speculation (judging from what one hears of it) in the European world is fast tending."—(pp. 276-278).

Again he says :—

"Seeing then that even in the most unsuspected quarters this atheistical leaven has made (of course wholly unknown to themselves) such alarming encroachments, what have we not to fear from the continued progress of human thought if we do not obtain grace from God to abandon our proud rationalism, and restore His voice within us to that place of honour and supremacy from which almost all parties just now seem madly conspiring still further to dethrone it."—(p. 279).

The remaining extracts—with reference to sanctity as the one great weapon of the Church, to the connection of sanctity with what may be called the art of Asceticism based on the corresponding science, to Monasticism as the embodiment of the science of Asceticism, to the preservation of this science and art in the Roman Church, and their absence in the English since the Reformation—tell their own story. The last of all touches on a view of which several applications have already been given—of the distinction in many cases between a believer's analysis of his belief on the one hand, and what his nature *really* adheres to on the other. A man may concentrate his attention on what he affirms or on what he denies. A Theist affirms that a personal God exists; a Deist denies a revelation. One Protestant denies and emancipates himself from Church authority; another embraces the Bible as God's word. On this principle two believers, holding in words the same doctrine, may be in reality one on the road to fuller truth, another on the road to further denial of truth; one to Catholicism, the other to infidelity.

Speaking of the Church's manifold duties in lifting up her voice and protesting against crime, he asks, how can she in her weakness arrest and secure attention? She can do so, he replies, by one weapon only—that of visible and undeniable sanctity in her members, which will command the respect of the world in spite of itself.

"How can she hope to obtain so much as a hearing from a luxurious nobility, or from a legislature almost compelled to be the slave of momentary shifts and time-serving expedients, or from a middle class wholly absorbed in the ceaseless press of secular business and the feverish thirst of worldly gain—how can she, I say, hope to obtain so much as a hearing, not from this or that individual, but from these *classes* of men, when she endeavours, as God's Vicegerent on earth, to impress on their consciences the duties of their several stations, and eagerly and clamorously warns them against their besetting sins? How can she hope to "cry aloud and spare not" and meet with aught in return save insolent contempt or forcible suppression of her voice?

There is only one fashion of instruments which will avail her; of one and only one kind are the weapons which she can oppose to worldly haughtiness and cruelty: these instruments, these weapons, are saints and saintly men. The very presence of a class of Christians who show in their whole lives and demeanour that they are dead to secular cares and pleasures, and that their hearts and affections are absorbed in heavenly realities; men who live a mortified life, a life above the world; who choose poverty, and *vow* celibacy, and refuse wealth and distinction even when offered; this it is which is an evidence of the unseen world that none can gainsay or resist, and which exercises an influence over the most careless or the most obdurate, against their will, almost without their knowledge. Contempt here is impossible; respect and admiration are extorted from the mass of men in spite of themselves."—(p. 413).

"Still more obvious is the truth here maintained in regard to by far the most important part of all a Church's political duties—the protection and consolation of the poor. On this subject human science is even at the present moment brought to a stand, like some powerful steam-engine without hands to work it, for want of a mass of *data* which, with our present machinery, cannot by possibility be supplied. Let us see a band of enthusiastic men, self-devoted to the cause, many of them following at an infinite distance the steps of Him "who, though He were rich, yet for our sakes became poor," all of them like to the poor in their manner of life, and like to the rich in their knowledge and education, except that the latter is deeply impregnated in every particular with the Catholic doctrine and spirit; let us see such men as these dispersed, as one may say, in swarms among our crowded manufacturing towns, bringing by their very presence both encouragement and edification, full of that tender lovingkindness which Catholic discipline alone implants, and looking on the poor, in the light which Catholics *do* look on them, as sacramental tokens of the Lord's nearer presence, what would not be the result? Soon would that suspicion dissolve which is perhaps even the most fearful sign of the times, that deep and rankling suspicion entertained by the poor that those above them are not really interested in their happiness and well-being; soon would they open all their griefs to these loving and intelligent sympathisers; what distresses, bodily or mental, most severely press upon them; what are their chief spiritual or temporal enemies; what the causes of their most corroding anxiety or their most desponding apathy; these and a thousand other particulars, now so hopelessly concealed from those who might devise a remedy, would come forth to light, and human science, powerless while confined to definitions and abstractions, might now at length exert its mighty aid in devising means of solace and relief."—(pp. 414-415).

Again, in fostering and developing sanctity in the Church, saints must be the teachers. They are the experts. They condemn Lutheran passivity, and so it must be got rid of if sanctity is to flourish. If the mob with *no* religious experience or acquirement are to refuse to obey, religious progress becomes impossible.

"It is impossible for Christians to ripen into saints, if ordinary men

are allowed to sit in judgment on their conduct and expressions, any more than in practical life a man could learn a difficult art, if he were required to adjust his course of study to the wishes of the uninstructed multitude. There must be the fullest and liveliest acknowledgment that self-discipline and holy obedience are the only keys which will unlock the treasure of religious truth; and that the multitude have to learn from them, not they from the multitude. We *cannot* unite contradictories; we cannot have Lutheran doctrine and saintly practice; we cannot have Christ and Antichrist; we must make our choice between them."—(p. 418).

One of the lessons, however, which the "science" of the saints teaches us is the necessity of gradual and long preparation of will and heart for the higher walks of sanctity. The *dilettante* brand new monasteries, which some ardent enthusiasts wished to induct into the Anglican Church, must fail grotesquely. Anglicanism had not yet afforded the training which is the necessary preliminary to success in such attempts. Such mushroom institutions would have only the external forms of conventual rule, without that inward life and spirit by which alone they could permanently flourish.

"A very general sense has been quite of late mysteriously growing up, of the incalculable benefits that might be derived under our present circumstances from the revival of monastic bodies; a most cheering circumstance indeed as a sign of the times, and a most honourable opinion to those who entertain it. Now, considering that our Reformed Church had its beginning in the overthrow of these institutions, and has had its continuance in the contempt and slander of them, it might have been confidently anticipated that *this* opinion at all events implied some adequate consciousness of our deplorable defects and corruptions. But no. The blind idolatry of our present system, so carefully instilled from his earliest years into the mind of the English Churchman, has shown itself in dreaming that we are already prepared for such institutions on a large scale. The same arrogance and self-complacency, which till lately impelled our Church to *denounce* the word Catholic, is now in many places only at work under another shape in urging her to *claim* it. Excellent men have omitted to consider the profound sagacity and experience required for the ordering and governance of such institutions as those which I have mentioned, and the unbounded humility and self-sacrifice indispensable in their inmates: or if they have *not* omitted to consider it, they fancy that such qualities are readily and widely attainable among ourselves at a moment's notice, or at least without any long course of previous preparation, which might be founded on a new and wisely-devised system of education and moral culture. Nay, as if it were their wish to bring our Church into contempt, they have talked of appointing our present bishops visitors of such bodies; prelates, of whom surely it is no disrespect to say, that they have not, as a body, displayed in their public language any deep and unquestioning reverence for the doctrines of asceticism and mortification, nor professed any profound and systematic acquaintance with the science of saints. Surely the very dilemma involved, either in proposing such an arrangement or in projecting an

extensive monastic scheme without it, should show how little prepared our Church is at present for such a sudden development. I am not of course denying that individual Christians, who share in the Catholic feeling which now springs up on all sides of us, will derive great benefit, and edification, and happiness, from uniting themselves voluntarily into small societies bound together by definite rules and frequent offices of devotion; but arrangements of this kind may be quite safely, and will be far more profitably left to adjust themselves: while any expectation of establishing such a system on a fixed and recognised basis within our Church is altogether visionary, until many well and wisely-employed years shall have elapsed. No! we must direct all our energy to devise some really powerful and available machinery for the moral education of the many, if we desire to reap any sufficient harvest of the mortified and contemplative few."—(pp. 434-436).

Of his favourite theme, the connection between the highest sanctity and assured orthodoxy, he thus speaks in this connection—

"No wonder that the monastic bodies have in every age been the great champions of orthodoxy, for they have been also the great witnesses and exemplars of an austere and supernatural life."—(p. 390).

He thus explains the principle to which I have already referred, that doctrines may be held as *affirmations* in their measure, or as *negations* of Catholic teaching; affirmations leading to fuller truth, negations to further error:—

"It is plain, that in proportion as we give ourselves up to an uninterrupted course of religious action, we realise and dwell upon our *positive* doctrines, and forget what may be called our *negative* opinions. To *hold* negative opinions indeed, except on authority, is unphilosophical and unreasonable; because we cannot form even a guess on the value of a doctrine until we have morally apprehended either that doctrine or its contradictory. But over and above this, it appears also that to *lay any stress* on them (even though we do hold them on authority) is a sure mark of carnal-mindedness and sluggishness in the spiritual life. There would be apparent exceptions to this statement, in the case of some most admirable men, who may have been taught to lay stress on these negations, and who fancy that they do so; but these are not real exceptions, for it will be found that in proportion as they talk naturally rather than on a theory, they sufficiently show how little real connection there is between the language they have learnt and their spiritual nature.

"And the converse is equally true: he who resolutely puts from his mind the mere negations of his hereditary creed, and girds himself to the task of carrying forward boldly and unsuspiciously the positive tenets which it contains, is, as one may say, already a Catholic potentially. Thus the very same outward expressions of doctrine may be held by different persons, Catholically or heretically, Christianly or unchristianly, according as they fix their mind on what is *affirmed* or on what is *denied*."—(p. 526).

## APPENDIX H

The following were the terms of the proposed "Test" referred to in Chapter XII, and afterwards abandoned :—

IN the same Convocation the following altered form of Statute, which will be promulgated on Monday the 10th day of February next, at ten o'clock, will be submitted to the House :—

TITULUS XVII—SECT. III.

§ 2. De Auctoritate et Officio Vice-Cancellarii.

1. After the words,

"Et ut Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et quoscunque alios minus recte de fide Catholica, et Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, sentientes, procul a finibus Universitatis amandandos curet.

"Quem in finem, quo quisque modo erga Doctrinam vel Disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ affectus sit, Subscriptionis criterio explorandi ipsi jus ac potestas esto,"

it will be proposed to insert the following :

Quoniam vero Articulos illos Fidei et Religionis, in quibus malesanæ opiniones, et præsertim Romanensium errores, reprehenduntur, ita nonnulli perperam interpretati sunt, ut erroribus istis vix aut ne vix quidem adversari videantur, nemini posthac, qui coram Vice-Cancellario, utpote minus recte de Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sentiens, conveniatur, Articulis subscribere fas sit, nisi prius Declarationi subscripserit sub hac forma :

Ego A. B. Articulis Fidei et Religionis, necnon tribus Articulis in Canone XXXVI° comprehensis subscripturus, profiteor, fide mea data huic Universitati, me Articulis istis omnibus et singulis eo sensu subscripturum, in quo eos ex animo credo et primitus editos esse, et nunc mihi ab Universitate propositos tanquam opinionum mearum certum ac indubitatum signum.

Also in the next sentence of the existing Statute, beginning, "Quod si quis S. Ordinibus initiatus," before the words "subscribere a Vice-Cancellario requisitus," to insert the following words :

"Una cum Declaratione supra-recitata."

2. It will also be proposed in the said sentence to omit the words "S. Ordinibus initiatus."

Should these alterations be approved, that part of the Statute, Tit. XVII. sect. iii. § 2, *De Auctoritate et Officio Vice-Cancellarii*, which will be affected by them, will stand as follows:—

. . . Et ut Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et quoscunque alios minus recte de fide Catholica et Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, sentientes, procul a finibus Universitatis amandandos curet.

Quem in finem, quo quisque modo erga Doctrinam vel Disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ affectus sit, Subscriptionis criterio explorandi, ipsi jus ac potestas esto. Quoniam vero Articulos illos Fidei et Religionis, in quibus male-sanæ opiniones, et præsertim Romanensium errores, reprehenduntur, ita nonnulli perperam interpretati sunt, ut erroribus istis vix aut ne vix quidem adversari videantur, nemini posthac, qui coram Vice-Cancellario, utpote minus recte de Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sentiens, conveniatur, Articulis subscribere fas sit nisi prius Declarationi subscripserit sub hac forma:

Ego A. B. Articulis Fidei et Religionis necnon tribus Articulis in Canone XXXVI° comprehensis subscripturus, profiteor, fide mea data huic Universitati, me Articulis istis omnibus et singulis eo sensu subscripturum, in quo eos ex animo credo et primitus editos esse, et nunc mihi ab Universitate propositos, tamquam opinionum mearum certum ac indubitatum signum.

Quoad si quis (sive Præfectus Domus cujusvis, sive alius quis) Articulis Fidei et Religionis, a Synodo Londini A.D. 1562 editis et confirmatis; necnon tribus Articulis comprehensis Canone XXXVI° Libri Constitutionum ac Canonum Ecclesiasticorum, editi in Synodo Londini cæpta A.D. 1603, una cum Declaratione supra-recitata, subscribere a Vice-Cancellario requisitus ter abnuerit seu recusaverit, ipso facto ab Universitate exterminetur et banniatur.

B. P. SYMONS, *Vice-Chancellor.*

DELEGATES' ROOM, *Dec.* 13, 1844.

## APPENDIX I

SINCE the body of this work was in type, further material has been placed at my disposal by the kindness of the Dean of Westminster, and of Sir George Grove and Dean Vaughan, the Master of the Temple, for illustrating the relations between Ward and Stanley, referred to in Chapter VI. Ward was still an undergraduate when they first met. Stanley, after first hearing of Ward from Cardwell as "almost the cleverest man in Oxford," met him for the first time in Faber's rooms in 1834. His description of the meeting has been already given in Chapter VI. Their relations to each other are described in a letter of Stanley's to the present Master of the Temple, which shall be cited shortly. One interesting fact comes to light in Stanley's letters in reference to Ward's presenting himself for orders in 1837. Ward denied the doctrines of Apostolical Succession and the priesthood, and consequently Oakeley had a scruple as to signing his testimonials. Oakeley wrote for advice to two bishops of the Establishment and to Keble—without, however, mentioning names. He asked if the doctrine of Apostolical Succession was essential to the English Church. The bishops did not reply, and Keble's reply was dubious. Oakeley then went to Newman, who arranged to see Ward and talk the matter over with him, and endeavour to persuade him to put off his ordination. "Newman had a long interview with Ward," writes Stanley, "listening to all that Ward said most candidly, and ended by bursting into tears, saying that he had never been so much interested in his life, and was too much overcome to continue the dialogue."

The following letter to Dean Vaughan bears the date of July 1836, and gives Stanley's impressions of Ward in the early years of their friendship:—

"Ward I see more than any one else, and I like him exceedingly. I hardly know how you would like him. I am afraid that at first you would not. He is very uncouth in appearance as you know, and also uncouth in his tastes, at least he has no taste for beauty of scenery and not very much for beauty in poetry, though on the other hand he is passionately fond of music, and I should think his taste in that line was

very good. On these points therefore,—he not sympathising with me in one, and I not with him in another,—we have not much in common. But what I do like very much in him is his great honesty and fearless and entire love of truth, and deep interest about all that concerns the happiness of the human race. These I never saw so strongly developed in anybody. We first became acquainted by his expressing in my presence great admiration of Arnold, mostly from a knowledge of his writings, and this not having been diminished by our further intercourse, has of course proved a great point of union. He is the best arguer and the most clear-headed man that I ever saw, I think—though in one way his logical faculty is one of his defects, for it has attained such gigantic height as rather to overshadow some of the other parts of his mind. He is also enthusiastically fond of mathematics—and, I believe, a very good mathematician. He is very fond of me, and added to these points, he is a very good man indeed, very humble, very devout, very affectionate, and has done a great deal to improve himself since I knew him. . . . I have said so much about him, because I am afraid that from what you have seen of him, or from what you have heard of him, you might very naturally but very seriously underrate him."

THE END

*Printed by* R. & R. CLARK, *Edinburgh*

# MESSRS. MACMILLAN AND CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

---

**Life of Frederick Denison Maurice.** Chiefly told in his own Letters. Edited by his Son, FREDERICK MAURICE. With two Portraits. Third Edition. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. 36s. Popular Edition (Fourth Thousand). Two vols. Crown 8vo. 16s.

---

BY MARK PATTISON, late Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.

**Memoirs.** Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.

**Sermons.** Crown 8vo. 6s.

**Milton.** Crown 8vo. Cloth, 1s. 6d. [*English Men of Letters Series.*

---

**James Fraser, Second Bishop of Manchester.** A Memoir (1818-1885). By T. HUGHES, Q.C. With Portrait. Popular Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.

**Sermons.** By the Right Rev. JAMES FRASER, D.D., Second Bishop of Manchester. In two volumes. Vol. I.—University and other Sermons. Vol. II.—Parochial and other Sermons. Edited by Rev. JOHN W. DIGGLE. Crown 8vo. 6s. each.

**Catharine and Craufurd Tait, Wife and Son of Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury: A Memoir.** Edited, at the request of the Archbishop, by the Rev. W. BENHAM, B.D., one of the Six Preachers of Canterbury Cathedral, etc. With Two Portraits engraved by JEENS. New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s. Popular Edition, abridged. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

**Life and Letters of John Coleridge Patteson, D.D.,** Missionary Bishop. By CHARLOTTE M. YONGE, Author of "The Heir of Redclyffe." With Portraits engraved by JEENS, after RICHMOND, and from a Photograph. Maps and Illustrations. Eighth Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 12s.

**The Story of a Fellow Soldier.** By FRANCES AWDRY. (A Life of Bishop Patteson for the Young.) With a Preface by CHARLOTTE M. YONGE. Globe 8vo. 2s. 6d.

**The Works of Arthur Hugh Clough,** sometime Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. In 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. each. Vol. I.—Poems. New and Revised Edition. Vol. II.—Prose Remains. With a Selection from his Letters, and a Memoir. Edited by his Wife.

**Poems.** By JOHN MOULTRIE. Complete Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 7s. each. Vol. I.—My Brother's Grave, Dream of Life, and other Poems. With Memoir by the Rev. Prebendary COLERIDGE. Vol. II.—Lays of the English Church, and other Poems. With Notices of the Rectors of Rugby, by M. A. H. BLOXAM.

**Letters of General C. G. Gordon to his Sister, M. A. Gordon.** Fourth and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

---

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

# MESSRS. MACMILLAN AND CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

BY MATTHEW ARNOLD.

**Essays in Criticism.** First Series, 9s. Second Series. With an Introductory Note by LORD COLERIDGE. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

**The Journal Intime of Henri-Frédéric Amiel.** Translated, with an Introduction and Notes, by Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD. New Edition. Crown 8vo. *[Just Ready.*

A NEW SELECTION OF THOMAS CARLYLE'S LETTERS.

**Letters of Thomas Carlyle, 1826-1836.** Edited by CHARLES ELIOT NORTON. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 18s.

UNIFORM WITH THE ABOVE.

**Early Letters of Thomas Carlyle.** Edited by CHARLES ELIOT NORTON. 2 vols. Vol. I.—1814-1821. Vol. II.—1821-1826. With Two Portraits. Crown 8vo. 18s.

**Goethe and Carlyle, Correspondence between.** Edited by CHARLES ELIOT NORTON. Crown 8vo. 9s.

**Reminiscences.** Edited by CHARLES ELIOT NORTON. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 12s.

BY R. H. HUTTON, M.A.

**Essays on some of the Modern Guides of English Thought in Matters of Faith.** Globe 8vo. 6s.

**Essays.** 2 vols. Globe 8vo. 6s. each. Vol. I.—Literary Essays. Vol. II.—Theological Essays.

BY AUBREY DE VERE.

**Essays, chiefly on Poetry.** 2 vols. Globe 8vo. 12s. Vol. I.—Criticisms on certain Poets. Vol. II.—Essays, Literary and Ethical.

**Literature in its Social Aspects: and other Essays.** Crown 8vo. *[In the press.*

**Thomas Poole and his Friends.** By Mrs. SANDFORD. With Portrait. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. 15s.

**The Life of William Barnes, Poet and Philologist.** By his Daughter, LUCY BAXTER ("Leader Scott"), Hon. Member of the Academy of Fine Arts, Florence; Author of "A Nook in the Apennines," "The Renaissance in Italy," etc. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

**Elizabeth Gilbert; and her Work for the Blind.** By FRANCES MARTIN, Author of "Angelique Arnauld." With Portrait. Crown 8vo. 6s.

**Biographical Sketches, 1852-1875.** By HARRIET MARTINEAU. With Four Additional Sketches, and Autobiographical Sketch. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.

**Memoir of Daniel Macmillan.** By THOMAS HUGHES, Q.C., Author of "Tom Brown's Schooldays," etc. With Portrait engraved on Steel by C. H. JEENS, from a painting by LOWES DICKINSON. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. POPULAR EDITION. Paper Covers. Crown 8vo. 1s.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

# MESSRS. MACMILLAN AND CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

BY E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D.,

Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford, Fellow of Oriel College, and Hon. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.

**Historical Essays.** First Series. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Contents:—The Mythical and Romantic Elements in Early English History—The Continuity of English History—The Relations between the Crown of England and Scotland—St. Thomas of Canterbury and his Biographers, etc.

**Historical Essays.** Second Series. Third Edition, with additional Essays. 10s. 6d.

Contents:—Ancient Greece and Mediæval Italy—Mr. Gladstone's Homer and the Homeric Ages—The Historians of Athens—The Athenian Democracy—Alexander the Great—Greece during the Macedonian Period—Mommsen's History of Rome—Lucius Cornelius Sulla—The Flavian Cæsars, etc. etc.

**Historical Essays.** Third Series. 8vo. 12s.

Contents:—First Impressions of Rome—The Illyrian Emperors and their Land—Augusta Treverorum—The Goths at Ravenna—Race and Language—The Byzantine Empire—First Impressions of Athens—Mediæval and Modern Greece—The Southern Slaves—Sicilian Cycles—The Normans at Palermo.

**The Growth of the English Constitution from the Earliest Times.** Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.

**Comparative Politics.** Lectures at the Royal Institution. To which is added "The Unity of History." 8vo. 14s.

**Historical and Architectural Sketches;** chiefly Italian. Illustrated by the Author. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**Subject and Neighbour Lands of Venice.** Being a Companion Volume to "Historical and Architectural Sketches." With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**English Towns and Districts.** A Series of Addresses and Essays. With Illustrations and a Map. 8vo. 14s.

**Greater Greece and Greater Britain: George Washington the Expander of England.** With an Appendix on IMPERIAL FEDERATION. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

**The Methods of Historical Study.** Eight Lectures read in the University of Oxford in Michaelmas Term, 1884, with the Inaugural Lecture on "The Office of the Historical Professor." 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**The Chief Periods of European History.** Six Lectures read in the University of Oxford in Trinity Term, 1885, with an Essay on "Greek Cities under Roman Rule." 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**Four Oxford Lectures, 1887. Fifty Years of European History—Teutonic Conquest in Gaul and Britain.** Demy 8vo. 5s.

**History of the Cathedral Church of Wells.** As Illustrating the History of the Cathedral Churches of the Old Foundation. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

**Old English History.** With Five Coloured Maps. Ninth Edition, revised. Extra fcap. 8vo. 6s.

---

BY J. R. SEELEY, M.A.,

Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge.

**Lectures and Essays.** 8vo. 10s. 6d.

**The Expansion of England.** Two Courses of Lectures. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.

**Our Colonial Expansion.** Extracts from "The Expansion of England." Crown 8vo. 1s.

---

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

# MESSRS. MACMILLAN AND CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

Now Ready, in Three Volumes, Demy 8vo, Price 54s.

**THE AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH.** By JAMES BRYCE, M.P., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford, Author of 'The Holy Roman Empire.' 3 Vols. Demy 8vo. 54s.

PART I.—The National Government.
PART II.—The State Governments.
PART III.—The Party System.
PART IV.—Public Opinion.
PART V.—Illustrations and Reflections.
PART VI.—Social Institutions.

Library Edition. Uniform with 'The American Commonwealth'

**THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE.** By JAMES BRYCE, M.P., D.C.L. Eighth Edition. LIBRARY EDITION. Demy 8vo. 14s.

**THE SWISS CONFEDERATION.** By SIR FRANCIS OTTIWELL ADAMS, K.C.M.G., C.B., late Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Bern, and C. D. CUNNINGHAM. 8vo. 14s.

BY ROUNDELL, EARL OF SELBORNE.

**A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment.** With an Introductory Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P., Popular Edition. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

**Ancient Facts and Fictions concerning Churches and Tithes.** Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

BY JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A., LL.D.

**A Short History of the English People.** With Coloured Maps, Genealogical Tables, and Chronological Annals. New Edition thoroughly revised. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d. 137th Thousand. Also an Edition in Four Parts for Schools, with the corresponding portion of Mr. Tait's Analysis bound up with each. Each Part 3s.

**History of the English People.** In 4 vols. 8vo.

Vol. I. EARLY ENGLAND, 449-1071—Foreign Kings, 1071-1214—The Charter, 1214-1291—The Parliament, 1307-1461. With Eight Coloured Maps. 8vo. 16s.
Vol. II. The Monarchy, 1461-1450—The Reformation, 1540-1603. 8vo. 16s.
Vol. III. Puritan England, 1603-1660—The Revolution, 1660-1688. With Four Maps. 8vo. 16s.
Vol. IV. The Revolution, 1688-1760—Modern England, 1760-1815. With Maps and Index. 8vo. 16s.

**The Making of England.** With Maps. 8vo. 16s.

**The Conquest of England.** With Maps and Portrait. 16s.

*Volumes I-IV, with Portraits, Now Ready, 2s. 6d. each.*

## ENGLISH MEN OF ACTION.

The First Four Volumes in the Series are now ready, namely:—

**GENERAL GORDON.** By Colonel Sir WILLIAM BUTLER.

The *Spectator* says:—'This is beyond all question the best of the narratives of the career of General Gordon that have as yet been published.'

**HENRY THE FIFTH.** By the Rev. A. J. CHURCH.

**LIVINGSTONE.** By Mr. THOMAS HUGHES.

**LORD LAWRENCE.** By Sir RICHARD TEMPLE.

The Volume to follow is:—

**WELLINGTON.** By Mr. GEORGE HOOPER. [In *June.*

*** Other Volumes are in the press and in preparation.

*Now publishing, crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d. each.*

## TWELVE ENGLISH STATESMEN.

The *Times* says:—'We had thought that the cheap issues of uniform volumes on all manner of subjects were being overdone, but the "Twelve English Statesmen," published by Messrs. Macmillan, induce us to reconsider that opinion. Without making invidious comparisons, we may say that nothing better of the sort has yet appeared, if we may judge by the five volumes before us. The names of the writers speak for themselves.'

**William the Conqueror.** By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D. [*Ready.*
**Henry II.** By Mrs. J. R. GREEN. [*Ready.*
**Edward I.** By F. YORK POWELL.
**Henry VII.** By JAMES GAIRDNER. [*Shortly.*
**Cardinal Wolsey.** By Professor M. CREIGHTON, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D. [*Ready.*
**Elizabeth.** By E. S. BEESLY.
**Oliver Cromwell.** By FREDERIC HARRISON. [*Ready.*
**William III.** By H. D. TRAILL. [*Ready.*
**Walpole.** By JOHN MORLEY. [*Shortly.*
**Chatham.** By JOHN MORLEY.
**Pitt.** By JOHN MORLEY. [*Shortly.*
**Peel.** By J. R. THURSFIELD. [*Shortly.*

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.